STATE OF ALABAMA ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES AND ENFORCEMENT MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA

IN RE: CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES

COMMITTEE MEETING

March 12, 2004

* * * * *

The following Committee

Meeting was had and done by the

Advisory Committee on Child Support

Guidelines and Enforcement, held on

March 12, 2004, at the Alabama

Judicial Building, 300 Dexter

Avenue, Montgomery, Alabama, and

transcribed from a videotape by

Laura A. Head, Court Reporter.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Honorable L. E. Gosa, Chairman District Court 330 1 st Street, N.E. Vernon, AL 35592

Honorable Lyn Stuart Supreme Court of Alabama 300 Dexter Avenue Montgomery, AL 36104

Honorable John B. Crawley Alabama Court of Civil Appeals 300 Dexter Avenue Montgomery, AL 36104

Honorable Terri L. Bozeman District Court P. O. Box 455 Hayneville, AL 36040

Honorable Mary C. Moore Circuit Clerk
Perry County Courthouse
P. O. Box 505
Marion, AL 36756-0505

Tom Bernier
Alabama Department of Human
Resources
Gordon Persons Building
50 N. Ripley Street
Montgomery, AL 36130

Jennifer Bush, Esquire
Legal Division
Alabama Department of Human
Resources
Gordon Persons Building
50 N. Ripley Street
Montgomery, AL 36130

Penny Davis, Esquire
Associate Director
Alabama Law Institute
P. O. Box 861425
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35486-0013
James R. Blackston
6185 Highway 195 North
Jasper, AL 35503-3409

L. Stephan Wright, Jr. 2125 Morris Avenue Birmingham, AL 35203

Bryant A. (Drew) Whitmire, Jr. Suite 501 215 Richard Arrington, Jr. Blvd. N Birmingham, AL 35203

Gordon F. Bailey, Jr., Esquire 1001 Noble Street, Suite 230 Anniston, AL 36201

Margaret M. Mayfield, Esquire 221 South 9th Street Opelika, AL 36801

Kelley Christian (for Bonnie Teague)

1 (Whereupon, the following Committee Meeting was had 2 3 and done on Videotape Three as follows:) 4 JUDGE GOSA: I think the best 5 6 format, if you will make your presentation, and then we'll open 8 it up to questions from the 9 committee, if that's agreeable 10 with you, Dr. Venohr. And then 11 after her presentation, Dr. Rogers 12 will make a presentation at the 13 request of Mr. Blackston, a committee member, and we have 14 15 asked him to give us a thirty-16 minute time slot. And after he 17 makes his presentation, we will 18 open it up to questions from the committee. 19 COMMITTEE MEMBER: 20 21 (Inaudible.) 22 JUDGE GOSA: V-e-n-o-h-r. 23 Anything from the committee

before we get started here?

24

25

Okay.

Dr. Venohr, we welcome you to

Alabama and look forward to

hearing from you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. JANE C. VENOHR: Thank
you. I've enjoyed Alabama very
much so far.

I've been involved with child support guidelines for over ten years. I first started or I first deeply got involved when I was in graduate school. I had to program all the states' child support guidelines. And what I --I was a research assistant back then, and this is a project from the National Institute of Health and a Public Network for Child Well-Being. It's a group of academics from the University of Michigan, Brenau, University of Colorado, Furman Institute which is a think tank in Washington, D. C., Child's Trends which is another think tank in Washington, D.C. And it's a group of folks

that are doing research, academic research, on the effects on children in disrupted families and stepfamilies and so forth.

And a particular professor I

was working with was doing

research on the impact of child

support guidelines, so that's why

I had to program every single

state's guidelines. And I became

pretty darn familiar with all

those state guidelines.

And what that research was used for eventually -- There were several studies that came out of it. One was that presumptive child support guidelines had increased the number of cases with child support orders on single-parent families. That was one of the academic studies that came out of that research.

Another one is that presumptive child support guidelines helped parents reach

agreements. And you can
visualize this as bargaining in
the shadow of the law, that if
parents know what the order
amount is going to be based upon
the guidelines, then they can
work an agreement around that.

Eventually, I moved on to

Policy Studies, Inc., and I've

been there for quite a while. And

I have assisted over twenty states

with child support guidelines,

just to give you an idea of my

background.

What I'm going to talk about today is I'm going to essentially walk through this report, and I'm going to start out with some introduction materials. And I'm going to start off with the federal requirements pertaining to child support guidelines. I'm going to give you a little bit more in-depth background information. Then I'm going to

updating the schedule and what assumptions we use, what information we use to update the Alabama schedule in this report.

Then I'm going to talk a little bit about the low-income adjustment and the self-support reserve. We did propose some alternative methods to include the self-support reserve.

And what that is is that -There is a self-support reserve incorporated in the existing schedule. And what it does is it makes sure that the noncustodial parent's income, after payment of child support and taxes, is never less than the poverty level. And obviously that's out of date now since the guidelines haven't been updated since the late eighties.

So I'm going to talk more about that assumption and ways to adjust for low income

noncustodial parents.

I'm also going to talk about a shared-parenting time adjustment. That's in Chapter VI. And I'm going to talk about adjustments for additional dependents. I'm going to talk about what other states do that also (inaudible). Then, finally, I'm going to give you some conclusions that are out of Chapter VII.

I think every body is aware here that the reason we're here is because federal requirements say that states must review their child support guidelines every four years. And as part of that review, they must consider the economic data on the cost of child-rearing.

And I want to go back to the federal requirements that states must have child support guidelines. And the requirements are pretty vague. There's mainly

three points. One is that they have to be based on specific descriptive numeric criteria. A n d that means -- What that means is (unintelligible) use a percent say that the order amount is seventeen percent of his income. And so if his income changed, they didn't have to go modify the order. And what happened on that is that they found or they suggested that it never made it to court and that violated this reg, this regulation. So they said no, it has to be expressed in a dollar amount.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, some people believe that this regright here means that it can't be expressed as a range.

But Georgia uses a range for their guidelines, and they say, you know, a certain percent.

Massachusetts gives a range of about five percent, and that's never been challenged.

The second point is that the
guidelines must consider all the
earnings and income of the
noncustodial parent, and that's
why you see states that include
lottery earnings, things like that.
Those are income, too.

The third point is that the child support guidelines was provided with child health care needs. There must be a provision in there.

In 1987, child support
guidelines, it was mandated that
they be statewide and advisory.
So it did mean that they were just
advisory. They didn't have to be
used in every case. In 1989,
however, the federal reg became
that they must be statewide with
a rebuttable presumption.

So to help states -- In the early eighties, there were only a few states that had child support guidelines. So to help states

1 develop child support guidelines, 2 the House Ways and Means 3 Committee asked the Federal 4 Office of Child Support 5 Enforcement to convene a 6 National Child Support Guidelines Advisory Panel. And they were 8 charged with helping states to 9 develop recommendations on state 10 guidelines.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The advisory panel was comprised of judicial, legislative, and child support officials. It included representatives of custodial and noncustodial parents advocacy groups. It included a law scholar. It included an economic scholar, who was actually Bob Willis who is in -- who's actually my dissertation chair's dissertation chair. So it's two So we're going to the second generation as far as our knowledge of guidelines. He is

an economics professor at the
University of Chicago. And he
was my dissertation chair's -who is Liz Peters, who is now -she's a professor at Cornell
University.

And the final point is that this panel recommended the Income Shares model or the Melson formula, and Alabama uses an Income Shares model. And how Bob Williams, who is my boss now -- how Dr. Williams played into this is he was the staff person for this panel. And when he first started on this project as a staff person -- or the principal investigator was the official title -- was he was with the National Center for State Courts.

There are thirty-three states
that use the Income Shares model.
And the concept I think everybody
is pretty familiar with; at least I
got that impression when I was at

the public hearings yesterday.

It's the child should be held harmless. That is, the child should receive the same amount of expenditures that child would

have received if the parents lived

together.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So if an intact family with four thousand -- or five thousand dollars in income spends a thousand dollars a month on that child, that's what the child should receive. And that amount is prorated between the parents according to their income. So if the father's share is sixty percent, then six hundred would be his share, and if the mother's share is forty percent, four hundred would be her share. Ιf the mother is the custodial parent, it's assumed that she spends that amount roughly on the child, and that the father's amount becomes child support.

What this shows is just how many states and which states are using the Income Shares model.

Again, there's thirty-three states.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

those states.

The second-most common model is just a flat -- well, some of -there's a few states that use varying, but it's a percentage of obligor income. So there's no consideration of the custodial parent or the obligee's income. There are thirteen states that use that model. That includes Georgia. They haven't changed their guidelines. That includes Tennessee. They haven't -- They are -- Actually, they just had a proposal to go to Income Shares up for public comment. And that includes Minnesota. They use a percent of the obligor income. There is no consideration of the custodial parent's income in

Now, in the Income Shares

model, increases in the custodial

parent's income will reduce the

order amounts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then there's a handful of states -- those are the orange ones on my screen. They're a pretty ugly mustard on that screen -- that use a different model. And it includes the Melson Formula, which was one of the ones that the national panel recommended. And the simplest way to explain the Melson Formula without going into any detail is it's a hybrid approach, that it starts off using Income Shares approach for the basic needs of the child. Those are prorated between the parents. And then it moves to a percentage of obligor income after that. that's how the Melson Formula works in a nutshell.

The other model, which is the

1 D. C.- Massachusetts approach, is just the opposite. It starts off 2 3 as a percent of obligor income, 4 and then once custodial parent's 5 income reaches a certain 6 threshold -- it's twenty thousand dollars per year less child care 8 costs in Massachusetts -- then it 9 kicks into an Income Shares 10 approach. And the rationale 11 behind that in Massachusetts is 12 that they believe that the 13 custodial parent should be given 14 some extra incentives to help get 15 her into the work market, or 16 effectively that's what it is.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I just want to go through some of the principles of that 1984 and '87 National Guidelines Panel because I think it's important, particularly since, you know, Alabama hasn't changed its guidelines for fifteen years. It's sometimes good to go back to basics and what it was founded

on. And these were the principles that led to -- that panel to recommend the Income Shares or the Melson Formula.

The first one is that both parents should share legal financial responsibility to their children. So it's not surprising that they recommended the Income Shares or the Melson Formula because those are the formulas that were out there that considered both parents' income.

The second principle was that the -- a guideline should consider the subsistence needs of the parents, yet establish a precedent to pay. So that's why there is a self-support reserve that's incorporated into the schedule.

There's one right now in the Alabama schedule that's based on the 1988 Federal Poverty

Guidelines that -- so the noncustodial parent's income,

1 after payment of child support 2 and taxes, is never below that 3 self-support reserve. Yet the 4 second part of that statement, Yet 5 establishes a precedent to pay, 6 that means that there shouldn't be zero ordered, that there should be 8 fifty dollars is usually the 9 minimum amount. And that is just 10 to make sure that the 11 noncustodial parent gets into the 12 system. Wages for the average 13 person -- I read a study recently 14 that we change jobs about 15 fourteen times from when you're 16 about eighteen to about thirty-17 eight. So if you get somebody into the system, then you can 18 19 modify the order in the event that 20 their income increases later. 21 that's why there's a precedent as such, at least some sort of order 22 23 regardless of whether it's a token 24 amount such as fifty dollars.

The third point is that the

25

child should share in a lifestyle that the parents can afford. And so what this means is that the guidelines shouldn't be a minimum or poverty level guidelines, that if the parents have the ability to contribute more -- If they are making a hundred thousand, forty thousand dollars or more or something like that, they can afford to pay more in child support than the poverty level or the basic needs for raising their child.

The fourth point is each child has a right to share in that parent's income subject to various factors. And what that means or it supports is it supports adjustments for additional dependents. And if you look at the original guidelines model, it did talk about it and by subject to various factors. One of the factors that

they include in these principles include age of the child, the income of the parents, et cetera.

This is the last of it, but I think it's good to think about these.

The fifth point is that each child is entitled to support amounts without respect to the parents' marital status. And by that, it means that just because a child is born out of wedlock, they shouldn't be treated any differently than a child that was born to married parents. They should have the same opportunities, the same sort of financial commitments provided as with parents that have similar incomes.

The sixth point is the gender of the custodial parent should make no difference in the guidelines determination. And I, you know -- There's not a

she. I mean, it's pretty genderneutral. And if I slip into he or
she today, it's only because
custodial parent and noncustodial
parent or nonresidential parent
and non-primary residential
parent is a very long phrase to
use. So I apologize for that.
The latest census statistics
actually show about fourteen
percent of custodial parents are
fathers.

The seventh point is that guidelines should not create extraneous negative effects on the major life decisions of either parent. And there's two things I want to say about this. The negative effects. It doesn't say positive effects. I mean, there's lots of positive effects from child support guidelines. There's a study by Lucia Nixon that was published in the Journal of Human

Resources in 1995, I believe, that says that child support has reduced divorce. And that's a positive outcome in our society. There's several studies out there, recent studies. One is by Irv Garfinkle, who's a professor at Columbia University, that finds that child support has reduced non-marital births. That's a positive effect.

Now, when I say extraneous negative effects, what then we're addressing is, one of the outcomes that you can see from it is that's one of the reasons that the second spouse's income is not considered. Because if it was considered, that would be a negative effect in that it would mean that the -- there might be some motivation or disincentive to remarry. So that is one of the reasons that you don't see the second spouse's income

considered in guidelines.

Finally, that the guidelines should encourage involvement from both parents and consider financial support in shared physical custody situations. And I'm going to talk more about that later, but we'll see that most Income Shares states do include a formula or provisions for shared-parenting time.

This isn't in the report. The stuff that I talked about earlier

-- I'm going to try to reference page numbers -- is in the report. That's in footnote one, if you wanted to look at the references. There's a footnote one, and what I did was just pull stuff out of that National Child Support Guidelines Advisory Committee report.

So this is something that I thought -- I think it's always helpful to look at what the

bordering states look like compared to your state. And I just happened to have this. This wasn't part of our contract, but I had the information under my fingertips. So I thought I'd just -- it might be good to use.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I'm going to be the total nerd and get my pointer out. I apologize for (inaudible).

And the solid line is Alabama, and Mississippi is definitely the lowest guidelines I've ever looked at. And what we see -- As far as the other states, what I've included, I included most of the bordering states and Louisiana because Louisiana is probably the closest to Alabama in income as far as median family income. Mississippi does have lower median family income or lower income than Alabama in general, and most of these other states have higher income. Tennessee

does and Georgia.

So the solid line is Alabama, and this is the scenario where we have one child, obligee income equals zero. Here, on this axis as we move along, we're showing increases in net income. And I'm using net income because obviously there's going to be different consequences and taxes among states -- for (inaudible) states. So just so we don't, you know, compare apples and oranges, I'm using net income.

So -- And I'm expressing it as a percent of obligor net income as far as what the order is. And you can see that Alabama gradually increases. As income increases, the percent devoted to child support gets smaller. And that's consistent with the economic data on child-rearing costs, that as parents have more income, they spend a smaller

portion of it on the child.

1

2 And let's see what state this 3 is. This is Louisiana. Slightly 4 more. And you notice that 5 Tennessee -- I mean, Alabama 6 stops quicker. And that's because of the ten thousand 8 gross. And then this one is 9 Florida. A little bit higher. 10 Now, Florida, Louisiana, and 11 Alabama are based on pretty much 12 the same evidence of child-13 rearing costs, but Florida is not 14 adjusted for its income. It's 15 using national data. Louisiana is 16 adjusted for its income. Alabama 17 is adjusted for its income. And 18 up here is proposed Tennessee. 19 Like I said, they are going to Income Shares, and there's a 20 21 proposal out there right now. 22 They're seeking public comments 23 on to go to Income Shares. Their 24 guidelines are administrative 25 rules, so it's in the rules right

now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And right here, this is their lower income and self-support reserve adjustment. Now, this is an anomaly. This is Georgia. It's the one that spikes up here. And the reason that Georgia does this is it's a flat percent of gross income. So when you convert that back to net income because our tax rates are progressive; they get higher as we make earned income -- then it becomes a higher proportion of it there. So I just think this is a useful benchmark. I hope you don't, you know -- I hope you feel the same because I feel like I added that at the last minute.

And this is the same thing for two children. Again, you can see Mississippi. The solid line is Alabama. And there is that anomaly with Georgia going up and spiking up there.

And this is with three children. You can see that Georgia doesn't fare as bad, and Alabama comes middle of the road on this.

And this is when we add income to the obligee. And because Mississippi is based on a flat percent net, it doesn't change. It's the same amount regardless of whether the obligee has income or not. And the same with Georgia. You can see the other states that are all Income Shares, they're coming down. They're going to be less in a situation where the obligee has income.

This is for two children. And you can see Alabama is the solid line there. And this is for three children.

Okay. I just wanted to give you that background information.

Now, I'm going to get into the

real meat, into the stuff of the report, the deep stuff.

This is an overview of the steps we took to update the schedule. This is on page III, Roman number III-4. This is a summary that I'm just going to put in my own words.

And I'm going to go through this over and over again (inaudible). It's very complicated, and we all learn differently. Some of us are visual. Some of us are more auditory. So I'm going to try to say it five or six different ways, every key point.

The first thing that happened is that we worked with Dr. David Betson, and I'm going to talk more about him later. He's the economist at the University of Notre Dame that does most of the measurements of the child-rearing costs. We worked with him to

I	realign the national
2	measurements. These are based
3	on national data. I'm going to
4	talk more about the data later.
5	We realign them for Alabama's
6	income, and you can look at Table
7	I-i and that's in the appendix
8	to show see why we do that.
9	If you look at Table I-i, you'll
10	see that Alabama in Alabama,
11	there's eight percent of the
12	families have incomes less than
13	ten thousand. Nationally, the
14	comparable percentage is five
15	point five. So Alabama is tilted
16	a little bit on the low income
17	end, towards the low income
18	scale.
19	So to account for that, what

So to account for that, what we do is we take the (unintelligible) data. We have that information from that table. What we do is we'll look at a household in the U.S. average pool. We'll look at, Okay,

1	what sthe income where we lind
2	that twenty percent of the U.S.
3	households have incomes less than
4	that. Okay. So twenty percent.
5	Let's say that that income ends
6	up being thirty thousand. Okay.
7	In the national data, if we look
8	at thirty thousand, we find that
9	twenty-five percent of that thirty
10	thousand is spent on child-rearing
11	costs. We take that twenty-five
12	percent spent on child-rearing
13	costs and we apply it to that
14	twenty percentile household in
15	Alabama, which makes an income
16	of twenty thousand. So you take
17	that twenty-five percent and
18	apply it to twenty thousand, and
19	that's how you do it. What it
20	does is it shifts the measurements
21	of child-rearing costs down.

And I think you saw it earlier on this previous overhead how these are all downward sloping because those measurements of

child-rearing costs indicate that a smaller portion of child-rearing costs -- a smaller portion of income is devoted to child-rearing costs the greater the income is. So, essentially, we're shifting it so the smaller is back that way using that methodology.

At the same time, Betson updates those measurements of child-rearing costs for current price levels. We used December 2003 Consumer Price Index because that was the most recent available when we developed the schedule. There's also (unintelligible) as far as when data was collected and when you can use it. And I'll talk more about what data collection (inaudible) Betson used.

The second step is that we subtract child care and extraordinary medical expenses because those are add-ons to the

schedule. That came up in the public hearing yesterday, how child care costs aren't incorporated into the schedule but they are treated separately. They're added on it afterwards. And extraordinary medical expenses are also subtracted out.

The third step is we do

develop a net income schedule,

that these measurements in childrearing costs that Betson uses are

usually expressed as a percent of
expenditures or percent of net

income. So we start with net -- a

net income schedule, and I'm
going to show more about that

later.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Can I ask a question? There was a lot of questions yesterday about what is considered net income.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. I'll talk about that. And I'm sorry. I'll

take more questions at the end.

But, you know, I want to get you

guys out of here. Usually I'm on

for a whole day (inaudible). But

yeah, and if you hear stuff like

that, be sure you call it

(inaudible).

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So then we subtract out the self-support reserve. That's the second to the last step, and then we back it out into gross income. And I'm going to show you that. I'm going to take (unintelligible) right now. And this was something we added to clarify this. So what you'll see is --This is what you'll see. You don't see this hidden cost here. But what you see is the gross income, and then you see the child support schedule for one, two, three, four, five, six children.

And these amounts are actually feeding off this column

that is hidden, which is the net equivalent to this gross income.

So if you back it out using -- And I'll explain what we use. We use federal taxes. We use state taxes. And we use FICA. Then we assume that all the income is taxed at what it would be for a single person, single taxpayer just claiming him - or herself.

And this is actually an assumption that's favorable to the NCP, and the reason being is that single persons pay more taxes than somebody with dependents. So this amount would be higher. This net income would be higher if we assumed anything else. That's the most favorable tax assumption we could use. And then if these amounts are higher, these amounts would be higher. This is feeding -- These amounts are feeding off of this.

And I think the concerns

1 yesterday on whether to use net 2 income or gross income were 3 valid. I mean, you know, I think 4 we've done this. This is the way 5 it was done in the existing 6 Alabama schedule only it was 1988 or '89 taxes were used. 8 This is exactly the same 9 methodology that was used. And I 10 think given recent tax changes --11 I mean, there have been some 12 huge tax changes. They're 13 scheduled to phase out in 2010. 14 Congress is thinking about maybe 15 phasing them out even sooner 16 because, you know, they have a 17 federal deficit. I mean, there's a 18 good point to going to net income 19 because we don't know what the 20 federal tax situations are. And 21 right now, the Alabama schedule 22 is based on taxes in 1988. So if 23 you went to net income, you 24 would deviate -- you'd eliminate 25 that problem of having to deal

with changes in federal taxes.

But it's not an easy solution because net income also creates other problems. And I think I don't have to tell you -- most of you guys this because you're practicing attorneys and judges -- that it's difficult to get gross income information in a lot of cases. So to get net income or to get tax information, that adds another level of discovery or difficulty. That's one disadvantage of using net income.

A second disadvantage is that if you have two similarly situated noncustodial parents -- let's say that they both earn thirty thousand a year and that the custodial parent in that case also earns thirty thousand dollars a year, and there's one child.

Okay. Now, let's suppose that one noncustodial parent is single, has no additional dependents, and

this other noncustodial parent, great person, adopts five kids.

What's going to happen to his tax consequences? All of a sudden, he's got five kids and his income, his net income, is going to shoot way up. And if you're using a net income schedule, orders can go up because he's got less taxable income now because he's got these five other kids. So that's a disadvantage.

And it's not just additional dependents. It could be marriage. It could housing principal, et cetera. You know, it all depends on what, you know, his or her tax consequences are.

It's not an easy solution. I'm not going to kid you. I mean, the taxes are a difficult thing. They

-- You know, even when you're not divorced, it causes people headaches, or when you don't have child support.

1	I'm going to show you
2	Vermont's solution, and a couple
3	of states do this. What they do
4	is they standardize net income,
5	which means that they start with
6	gross income, a gross the
7	parent's gross income. And they
8	say, Okay, you're the
9	noncustodial parent, We're going
10	to assume that your tax
11	consequences are that of a single
12	taxpayer. And for the custodial
13	parent, they'll say, Okay, we're
14	going to assume that your tax
15	consequences are head of
16	household with one child, one
17	dependent, and that you're going
18	to get the EITC, earned income
19	tax credit, that you're going to
20	get the child tax credit, blah,
21	blah, blah.
22	And how that works is this
23	is Vermont is that they have

another schedule that shows the tax rates. So here we have a

24

25

column that looks a lot like the regular child support schedule. Here we have income, only this would be the individual parent's income. In this column, we show what the equivalent for one child is, using the midpoint in this end of the gross income. And this is the custodial parent's after-tax income for one child, assuming that she claims the child and so forth. And this column is for two children. It assumes that she claims two children.

I like that. You're shaking your head. It tells me you figured it out and some people are understanding it because it's complicated.

And the final column is the NCP's after-tax income, assuming that he files as a single taxpayer.

And so what you would do in this case is, you know, if we have a custodial parent that makes

twenty-five hundred, we go up
there -- and she has one child -we assume her income is twentyone oh six. And the noncustodial
parent actually made twenty-five
hundred, too. We'd assume his
income, after-tax income, is
nineteen thirty-six. Then we add
those together, and then we go to
the net income schedule. And
then you're back into how
Alabama does it.

And this obviously adds an extra step. It adds an extra level of complication. And in addition, Vermont is one of those thirty-four states that has a shared-parenting adjustment. So they have to have another table for when there is shared parenting because the tax consequences there are assumed to be split.

And -- Let's see. What else do I want to say about this?

Oh, it should be clear that when Vermont does this, they use the monthly income withholding, the monthly employer withholding guides for taxes and that there is -- And that's a really important point when you're thinking about taxes. And if you're going to do anything about taxes, you have to understand the difference between monthly employer withholdings and year-end because they're not always equal.

I mean, I remember the days when I was a single person with a salary and, you know, I filed my taxes. I did EZ, the 1040 form.

I could never figure out the exact amount of withholdings, you know. I didn't have any property, nothing. And why did I always owe or they owe me at the end of the year? It's because those formulas are not exactly the same.

In particular, the earned income tax credit, when they advance that, they don't advance all of it to custodial parents or eligible folks. And in a big sense, from the IRS point of view, from the flipside, you don't want to end up in a position of refunding the EITC. You know, the IRS probably doesn't want to do that.

But the earned income tax credit is to help alleviate poverty. They don't -- The IRS doesn't want to be giving out money, and then at the end of the year, let's say that those folks changed jobs or the custodial parent changed jobs. They might not be eligible for that earned income tax credit, and it would be awful to have to pay it back. So that's one of the reasons that the feds do not advance all of the EITC, the earned income tax

credit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And Vermont's stance is that
they would rather use the monthly
employer withholding guide
because most people live paycheck
to paycheck, rather than using the
year-end.

Okay. So surprisingly, there's not a lot of differences between using what Alabama does, where you have that hidden column, and using the Vermont approach. And what this graph does is just illustrate that. The one child obligor income equals fifty percent of the obligee income. Here we just use those built-in withholding tables, that hidden column that I showed you in that first overhead, and here that Vermont method where we did that extra step. And you can see that (unintelligible) results in a little bit different child support order (unintelligible) is

negligible. And this includes the child tax credit, by the way. We averaged them in even though it's not part of, you know, the employer withholding tables. And this is for six children. And you can see even in this case where they're going to get a much larger child tax credit because of the six children, that they're pretty close.

So it really is a tradeoff in terms of simplicity and making it more obvious what's happening there. And, unfortunately, there's not an easy solution when it comes to taxes.

Okay. We're turning to the other factors that are addressed in the update of the schedule.

This is from Chapters III and V, and I just summarized it on the table. When we updated the schedule, we used the same methodology that was used back

then (Inaudible). And	there are a
few differences. We u	ise more
current economic facto	ors. The
current schedule we	re going
to talk more about thi	s i s
based on it is based	d on the
economic study of chi	ld-rearing
costs that was publish	ed in 1984.
We're going to use so	mething that
was published in (vide	e o t a p e
malfunction).	

I'm going to talk more about the data that were used. And for the current schedule, the data were collected in 1972, and this was a Consumer Expenditure

Survey. And it did include six Alabama counties, and those -- Actually, I'm not sure which Alabama counties it included back then. But I know it included (inaudible). The current schedule is based on (videotape malfunction) price levels. We updated it, as I said earlier, to

December 2003 price levels. I explained earlier that we used census data to realign it, to make that shift.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The current schedule is based 1980 census data. The updated schedule is based on 2002 supplemental census data. The tax rates in the current schedule are '87. We're using 2004. The self-support reserve was four four seven a month, which is the equivalent to the federal poverty guidelines for one person in 1986. We're using seven fortyeight, which is equivalent to the poverty level in 2003. And they just released the 2004 poverty level. We didn't have enough time to put it in there. They just released it three weeks ago. The current federal poverty guidelines for one person is seven hundred and seventy-six dollars. So it's a little bit more than the seven

forty-eight amount.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, finally, as I mentioned earlier, we excluded extraordinary medical expenses, but the schedule does include some ordinary medical expenses. And the reason being is that children, we hope, will incur some medical costs just through routine checkups and some aspirin, Band-Aids, et cetera. And the schedule -- The existing Alabama schedule assumes those expenses are a hundred dollars per year per child. The proposed schedule assumes that they are two hundred and fifty dollars per year per child, and that's based on national studies on what the average out-of-pocket expenses are.

So I'm going to talk more about the rest of these items.

I'd like to get down to the bottom line. I think -- I've been in

Alabama for two days now, and I don't think you guys like to waste time around here. So I'm going to tell you what the bottom line is first, and then I'm going to tell you why it ends up this way, what's the difference between the existing schedule and what's the difference between the proposed schedule. And you can even see it mapped out in every single numbered appendix, the very last few pages of this report, Appendix V.

And surprisingly, despite

having a sixty-one percent

increase in prices since the

schedule was last reviewed, we

have orders going down. And we

have orders or basic obligations

-- this is before they're

converted to orders -- going up.

And most people look at me and

they go, What, How can this be,

We haven't updated the schedule

in so many years. I mean, in
Alabama's case, we're talking
fifteen years. How can we have
obligations going down as well as
going up?

Well, the biggest -- Let me talk about the basic obligations going up first. The biggest factor is -- and this is going to be true for the ones going down, too -- is the new measurements of child-rearing costs are higher in some areas but not all. And I'm going to show you more on that.

Also, we have an increase in price levels. We had about a sixty-one percent increase in price levels, so that should be no surprise that the schedule is going down.

A third factor is that the effective tax rates actually decreased, and this is largely due to the tax reform that happened last summer.

Now, why do we have some basic obligations going down? Well, the biggest factor is these new measurements in child-rearing costs. It's just the numbers are landing a lot differently, and we're also using different -- I'm going to talk about it more. We're using the Rothbarth methodology rather than the (inaudible) methodology.

And then a second factor is more is being subtracted from the schedule because of increased child care costs and increased medical costs, and I don't think anybody in this room is probably surprised that we have increases in child care and medical costs.

So when those are subtracted out, there's a higher amount being subtracted. So that's also contributing to the decrease.

A third thing that I want to talk about updating the schedule

and I think it's really
important is that since we're
using more recent data, there's a
bigger pool of households with
higher incomes. So it allows the
schedule to go up to twenty
thousand dollars per month, where
when we had income data from
'72, '73 (unintelligible), that we
could only go up to ten thousand
dollars per month

And the comparisons are, you know -- You look at the comparisons. You'll see the side by sides. There's graphs in Appendix IV and Appendix V.
There's a bigger discussion of comparisons in Chapter -- is it V?
Chapter V.

So I just want to talk a little bit about where those measurements come from, measurements of child-rearing costs come from. There was a study done by Dr. Thomas

Espenshade, and it was for the specific purposes of developing child support guidelines. It was for child welfare, the foster care parents. That was the intent of the study. It was funded through the National Institute for Health. It was the study that was used by the National Child Support Guidelines Project in 1980 to develop a prototype child support schedule.

And that's where Alabama started was from this prototype Income Shares schedule, and it was modified to account for Alabama's taxes and for Alabama's relatively low income. It used a Consumer Expenditure Survey, 1972-'73.

All studies that I'm going to talk about and all reputable studies that are used in child support guidelines use a Consumer Expenditure Survey, and it does

include Alabama. It includes six counties in Alabama. And the reason being is that it's the most comprehensive survey out there on expenditures. It includes some two thousand items, and it surveys about eight thousand households per year. And it would just be impossible to replicate that sort of study at a state level. Although, I would encourage it because I love data and I love information. I mean, the academic side of me says, Yes, yes, please states, do your own study. But as somebody that is paid to consult with states, I would have to say that it's not a good use of tax dollars, money. You know, it would probably take two or three years to do the study and a hundred thousand to do it, and I'm not even sure you're going to get data that was much different than what you see as it

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is.

1

21

25

2 Originally, Espenshade's study 3 was used in twenty-six states. There are still ten states that 4 5 base at least a part of their 6 guidelines or a part of their schedule on Espenshade, including 8 Alabama. And it's based on a 9 Marginal Cost approach to 10 measuring child-rearing costs. 11 And what that means is that there 12 are so many expenditures made in 13 a household that are intertwined between the adult and the 14 15 children. There's housing. 16 mean, how do you know what share 17 of the housing expenditures go to 18 the child? Transportation, what percent of the vehicle goes to the 19 20 Even the peanut butter jar, I mean, what percent is eaten 22 by the child? There's probably 23 eighty percent of all expenditures 24 are commingled in a household.

So the Marginal Cost

approach, what it does is it looks at households without children -for families without children and families with children. And they take families that are equally well off, and then it looks at the difference in expenditures in that family without children, husband and wife, and that family with children. And the difference is how much it costs to raise children.

And the trick to this Marginal Cost approach methodology is whether those households are equally well off. And, you know, in Espenshade's study, he used the Engel methodology in his food shares. It's kind of a (inaudible) approach, and I'm going to talk more about the Engel methodology in a minute.

Where -- The proposed schedule is based on measurements developed by Dr.

David Betson, Professor of Economics, University of Notre Dame. He was commissioned by the Department of Health and Human Services in 1990 to develop new measurements for child-rearing costs, and this study was at the request of Congress again. It's part of the Family Support Act. And with the exclusive purpose of providing states with information that could be used in periodic guideline reviews. So that's why he did this study.

And he used actually five different methodologies. There's a whole bunch of other alternatives besides this Marginal Cost approach, and there's even variations of this Marginal Cost approach where, you know, they look at a household with children and a household without children and compare the difference. I

talked about the Engel

methodology that looks at food shares to see if households are equally well off. Well, Betson also used the Rothbarth methodology, which looks at expenditures of adult goods.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The method -- Betson's conclusion from his results were that the Rothbarth methodology was the most plausible, the most robust. Betson did the study in 1990 using '80-'86 data. In 2001, he received some type of funding from the Institute for Research on Poverty and through California and Michigan and was able to update his measurements using the exact same methodology, same computer (inaudible), et cetera, et cetera. And he's using '96-'99 data.

And I should go back and mention that this Consumer Expenditure Survey, there's about

eight thousand households per year that are surveyed, and a household stays in there for five consecutive quarters. It's a rolling sample. So these would be households surveyed in '96 through '99 is the aggregate number of years. This would be households from '80-'86 (unintelligible). And then what the Alabama schedule is based on right now is the households that were surveyed from '72 to'73. So Betson still concluded that the Rothbarth methodology is the best to use in 2001.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I'm just going to walk through these different measurements of child-rearing costs, and these are the averages. They're not broken down by income levels. And this is Exhibit 2 in Chapter II. And Exhibit 2 reaches averages in tabular form, and we just put it

in graphs to make it easier to look at (inaudible).

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So this first column is what the Alabama schedule is based on. That's the Espenshade-Engel --That's with Dr. Espenshade's estimates using the Engel methodology applied to '72-'73 data. In this, we're just looking at percent of total family expenditures devoted to childrearing costs. And for one child, you can see it's twenty-four percent on the average. If you look at the Betson-Engel, he also used the Engel approach, and it went up noticeably to thirty percent. But if you look at his Rothbarth, which is what we're using to update this schedule, it's twenty-five percent. So it's an incremental change.

We also have the USDA, and like I said, all these studies use the Consumer Expenditure Survey.

The USDA is up there. And this column right here, we just prorated it. You know, let's say that there was a family that spent one thousand dollars a month on household expenditures, and there was three family members. If we prorated it, it would mean that each family member uses three hundred and thirty-three dollars per month.

So -- But we know (inaudible) that children actually cost less than adults. So we know this thirty-three percent is definitely the upper boundary because, as I said, children cost less than adults.

Now, for two children, here is what the current schedule is based on. And you can see that we're going to the middle column. So that's a drop. That's why you're going to see some of the obligations going down. And the

same with three children, you're going to see it more for three children going down, going down once we use these new measurements.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, again, you could build a schedule based on the Betson-Engel, which is the second column, if you wanted to. There's no reason you couldn't. But Betson does believe that these are better measurements, and we do have some reservations about this because in our -- I mean, it doesn't make sense to set child support guidelines above what you withhold (unintelligible) the Consumer Credit Protection limit. So fifty percent -- fifty, sixty-five percent of after-tax income. So that would be a lot of orders. But most of your orders, probably eighty percent of your orders (inaudible).

1	Now, the Betson study was
2	independently evaluated by the
3	Lewin Group. They were
4	contracted by the DHHS to review
5	Betson's work, and that Lewin
6	Group is referenced in Chapter II
7	Their study is referenced and
8	(inaudible). So is Betson's work
9	(inaudible). They are both
10	government documents, so there
11	should be a library that
12	(inaudible).

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And what the Lewin Group concluded is that the Engel methodology overstates actual child-rearing costs. And then this is the methodology that the Alabama schedule is currently based on and is used by Dr. Espenshade and also used by Betson. And that the Rothbarth methodology understates actual child-rearing costs. And they've recommended that states use any level between those two amounts. And they also concluded that the USDA methodology overstates actual children-rearing costs.

Most states that have updated their schedule in the last ten years have used the Betson-Rothbarth methodology.

What this does is it just shows that gradation that I've been talking about, about how as income increases, a smaller percent of child-rearing costs are devoted -- or a smaller percentage of net income is devoted to child-rearing costs.

And this is the exhibit at the end of Chapter II. And it shows that for one child (inaudible), two children, three children. And you can see that's going down.

And the Betson-Rothbarth have a steeper grade than the Espenshade-Engel. So that's a big contributor to that decrease that you see at the higher end of

the schedule.

These are the graphs from Chapter V and Appendix IV, and I didn't add (inaudible) into it.

And it shows the existing Alabama schedule as the solid line. This diamond right here -- the diamond one, that's the proposed Alabama. Here's that increase in the self-support reserve that I'm going to talk about more in a minute, big increase. And it really will result in orders going down. I'm going to talk more about the options with that in a minute.

And what I did -- I was just curious. I took the existing schedule, which is based on the Espenshade, and I updated it for inflation and taxes only, and that's this line here. And then you see that the Rothbarth does result in a little bit of increase for one child in this portion of (inaudible). This is a situation

where there is no income by the obligee.

Here you see it for two children. Again, you can see that the one with the diamonds is the increase in the schedule, and this dotted line is just updated for inflation. Didn't do anything for that self-support reserve. So you can see that the Rothbarth doesn't have that increase at the high end.

This is for three children.

You can really see the Rothbarth decrease. And, again, this is with that self-support reserve I'm going to talk about later. And this is the situation when obligee's income is half as much as obligor's. And if you're like most states, the ratio is probably going to average closer to sixty, usually in the range of forty to sixty percent, just to show you the (inaudible).

So in most states, fifty to seventy percent of the orders involve one child, I would say is a safe range. So this is going to be the most difficult situation case scenario. You'll see some increases right there, but decreases here.

This for two children. This is for three children. Again, this is a case where the obligee is making half as much as the obligor.

I'm going to talk more about the low-income adjustment. This is definitely a policy decision, and it's a hot issue nationally. And the reason that it's a hot issue nationally is that there's a lot of concern about arrears out there. Why do we have so much unpaid child support? And in Alabama, it's approaching about two million in total (inaudible).

And there's a study by Elaine

1	Sorenson at the Urban Institute
2	who's been doing a lot of
3	research on this. And what she is
4	finding is that low-income
5	parents that low-income
6	noncustodial parents have
7	children with low-income
8	noncustodial parents. That both
9	parents are low income. And
10	we've done a lot in welfare
11	reform to help low-income
12	custodial parents, particularly
13	those TANF or near TANF get
14	jobs, but we haven't helped low-
15	income noncustodial fathers get
16	jobs and do similar sort of
17	assistance, that we don't have the
18	same type of programs as we do
19	TANF. What's TANF called in
20	Alabama?
21	COMMITTEE MEMBER: TANF.
22	DR. VENOHR: It's
23	straightforward, yes.
24	So there's a lot of argument
25	out there that we've been asking

low-income noncustodial parents
to pay beyond what they can pay.
There is articles that say, you
know, Not Deadbeat but Death
Row. That's the title of an
article. There's another one
that's called, Squeezing Blood
out of a Turnip, et cetera, et
cetera.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

These are marginally employed noncustodial parents. They -- A lot of them are incarcerated. A lot of them are working pick-up jobs, working temporary jobs. They're in and out of the labor market. They don't have a lot of job strengths. A lot of them are young. And so the argument is then that, Well, may be we need to rethink how we do things and maybe we need (inaudible) ones at risk and -- which includes, you know, updating the child support schedules to include most recent poverty level so that it has a

more generous self-support
reserve. And, also, the hope is
is that, yes, we're going to lower
orders. We're going to lower
orders, but (unintelligible) the
system, they'll be monitored.
They might be referred to a jobtraining program to help them
advance their careers so they can
be in a position to economically
support their children, et cetera.
And that's the movement and some
of the background.

Here is an interesting statistic that Elaine Sorenson published. She distributed it in the last year at the National Conference of -- the State Legislators Conference in Vale. And what she did was she looked at each state, and she looked at tax intercepts because the noncustodial parents are so far in arrears that they can do federal tax intercepts to any tax refunds

they might be getting. And she
has some national data from
quarterly wages (unintelligible).
And she found that sixty-seven
percent of those that had tax
intercepts in Alabama so they
were in arrears, sixty-seven
percent of them had income of ten
thousand dollars per year or less.
So what that means is the bulk of
the arrears in Alabama is owed by
noncustodial parents that earn ten
thousand dollars per year or less.
So that's pretty close to minimum
wage. Minimum wage is five
fifteen an hour right now. So
that's a little less than nine
hundred a month.

But on the other hand, when I show them these orders going down, people say, Well, what about the children. You know, we've got a poor noncustodial parent, and we've got a poor custodial

parent. What do you do: I mean,
unfortunately, this is
(unintelligible). It's just a no-
win situation in these cases.
And, you know, some of these
Somebody is going to get
shortchanged, but we don't even
know if in these Obviously, in
these lower income cases in
Alabama, they're not paying
anyway.

So it's -- I did some research.

I've been working with D. C. And talk about someplace that's really impoverished, it's probably one of the poorest places I've ever worked. I did a case file review there, and the statistic -- I had some higher income folks. I had some low income folks. And I had some low incomes that are paying forty percent of what they earn in child support, and at the high incomes, they were paying eighty percent of what they owed.

soft does make a difference.
You know, your income does
affect or the noncustodial
parent's income does affect what
they pay. So that goes feeds
into that argument, You can't
squeeze blood out of a turnip.

But I just want to be clear that it is a policy decision because it just -- you're balancing the needs of custodial parents and noncustodial parents. And I wish there was an easy solution, but there's not.

And when we updated the schedule, what we did was we just used the same methodology that was used back in '88. So we just updated it using the most current federal poverty guidelines, and that's with the self-support reserve at seven forty-eight.

So there are some states that have chosen consciously to have the self-support reserve lower

1	than seven forty-eight or the
2	current poverty level. And there
3	are some states that have
4	consciously chosen to have that
5	higher. And the range is four
6	hundred and forty-three. There is
7	a state that has a lower self-
8	support reserve than Alabama. I
9	can't tell you what it is off the
10	top of my head. It might be
11	Virginia or It's one of the
12	states that have never updated
13	their schedule, which is Virginia,
14	Alabama, Maryland, Kentucky,
15	Indiana. There's part of
16	Louisiana that have (inaudible).
17	And the highest amount is a
18	hundred and thirty-five percent of
19	the poverty, which would be about
20	fifteen fifty is the amount that
21	was used for self-support reserve.
22	And not all states have self-

support reserves. Most percentof-obligor-income states, such as
Georgia, they don't have a self-

23

24

25

support reserve. They don't do any sort of adjustments for low income. Tennessee, the existing guidelines doesn't. They will when they go to Income Shares. Louisiana has a self-support reserve. Mississippi doesn't. Florida does.

Now, I'm going to talk a little bit about the adjustment in the very first Appendix and some information in Chapter III. We can incorporate -- Right now, that self-support reserve is invisible in this schedule. Probably a lot of you guys didn't even know about it. And we did another little calculation (inaudible) onto that to incorporate it.

There are some states that
they shaded it so it's obvious
when the noncustodial parent gets
a break from a low income. And
then there are some states that
include it in their worksheet, and

I'm going to show you. It's included in the schedule in twenty-one states, shaded in four states, and included in the worksheet in eleven states.

(Inaudible.) Oh, it's New York.

Right now, going hand in hand with that self-support reserve is a minimum order. As I mentioned earlier, that there is -- that the panel felt like there should be at least a token amount, a minimum order so that there shouldn't be a zero order, that it's better to establish some sort of number, precedent, that the noncustodial parent is to pay or an amount of financial obligation to his or her child.

Right now in Alabama, it's discretionary what that amount should be if it's five hundred and fifty gross or less. The proposed is fifty, but this is, again, a policy decision. Mainly, we put

```
1
      that number in there because it's
2
      easier to graph. It's hard to
3
      graph discretionary. So if you
      wanted to pull that out
4
5
      (inaudible). And that would be
6
      eight fifty. The reason it's
7
      bumped up is to accommodate that
8
      self-support reserve of seven
9
      hundred and forty-eight per
10
      month. So we have to bump it up
11
      because obviously, if his income
12
      was seven hundred and fifty net,
13
      he would only have two dollars
14
      difference between the self-
15
      support reserve and his net
16
      income. So there would only be
17
      two dollars available for child
18
      support. So that's how we do it.
19
      You look at the difference
20
      between seven forty-eight and the
21
      after-tax income. And most
22
      states came out around six fifty,
23
      and that's a net (inaudible).
24
          I just -- Unfortunately --
```

Well, you can see the shaded

25

This is part of Exhibit Six, area. and I only selected a few incomes here. You can see how that shaded area is where that selfsupport reserve is incorporated into the schedule, and it fades What we do is we look at the difference between the obligor's net income and his selfsupport reserve. And then for one child, we multiply that by ninety percent. So not every single dollars goes to child support. There's some work incentive.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For two children, we multiply that difference by ninety-one percent. So there is, again, some sort of work incentive.

So when that amount -- When that equation I just described to you is more than what it would be if we just used the strict Betson-Rothbarth numbers, then we go to Betson-Rothbarth's numbers, and

those break points are shown
right there. That's the shaded
area where that self-support
reserve is incorporated. You just
see that gradually, from one
child, one oh five; or two
children, one oh six, or three
children, one oh seven; one oh
eight for four; five children, one
oh nine; six children, one one
one. You can see it's just a
little bit more (unintelligible).

It's not that consistent here, which is not surprising, because here we're basing it on actual data, actual measurements of child-rearing costs, actual family data. So, you know, families are inconsistent, so you're not going to all see a consistent increase from one child to two children and three children and so forth.

Now, the way the shaded area works is that if the noncustodial parent's income alone falls into

the shaded area, you use the obligee -- you can assume the obligee's income is zero, and then you calculate support based on that. So if you have an obligor that earns a thousand dollars per month and an obligee that earns a thousand dollars per month and there is one child, obligor's income falls into the shaded area. And here is thousand dollars. Here's one child. It's in the shaded area. So we just assume her income is zero, and the order amount would be a hundred and five dollars in that case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, if we didn't do that,
we'd have two thousand dollars in
combined income, which is this
amount here, and the basic
obligation is four hundred and six
dollars. And since the parents
have equal income, we divide it
by two, and the order amount

would be two hundred and three dollars. So you can see how much of a break they're getting.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

states.

And the reason they shade that is because there's an anomaly that occurs when you get into the really high incomes. So it's going to be an unlikely case. But you could have a case where the custodial parent makes ten thousand dollars a year, and the noncustodial makes fifty dollars. Obviously, his share of the basic obligation is going to be very, very, very small. So in that situation, you would want to do two calculations and take the lesser of those two. And that's how those states use the shaded area, you know, to ensure that he really is going to get that break. South Carolina is a state that used the shaded area, Connecticut. There's a few

Another approach to adjusting for low income -- And this is more explicit, and I think these days it's better to get explicit because of all the criticism. A lot of states don't realize that they have a low-income adjustment in there. So it does create an extra step, but at least everybody knows what's being done. And you do the adjustment in the worksheet.

And here, I've only -- This is from Appendix A. I've got a whole worksheet in there, and I've only taken a few lines, the most important lines, to put them on the screen here. Here we have certain gross income. Here we're just looking at the percentage, figuring each parent's percentage. And then we figured out the basic obligations from the schedule. We've prorated it.

share -- we're going to assume
that the father is the
noncustodial parent -- his share
is two hundred and sixteen
dollars.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So now, we're going to go to ability to pay compilation. That's what Vermont calls it. Vermont came up with this methodology. And they set the --In this case, we have a selfsupport reserve of seven hundred and forty-eight. So the noncustodial parent's ability to pay is the difference between his income and the self-support reserve, which is a hundred and fifty-two dollars per month. So the child support obligation is set at the lower, from this line to this line, which is a hundred and fifty-two. So it's the same sort of calculation, but now we made it exclusive in the worksheet.

There are a couple of nuances

and variations to this that I
should explain. And notice that I
don't have child care and
extraordinary medical or health
insurance here. It's not -- I
didn't include it in this simple
calculation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In Vermont, those calculations are made up here, and then the comparison is done. So in situations where there's an extraordinary amount of child care -- I think we heard in the public hearings yesterday about a couple of cases where their orders were high, and it was because of child care costs. And in cases with this, the noncustodial parent would not --If you put the child care above this line, the noncustodial parent wouldn't be paying any child care. He would just be paying the difference between his income and the self-support reserve.

1	Another little nuance to this
2	is the worksheet that I included
3	in Appendix A No, it's not
4	Appendix A. I'm sorry. It's
5	Appendix III. Appendix III.
6	Worksheet A. If you look at this,
7	this is West Virginia's
8	worksheet. As you look at line
9	ten, they multiply the
10	noncustodial parent's income by
11	eighty-five percent, and that's to
12	simulate the tax effect because
13	remember as you recall earlier,
14	I said that the way the self-
15	support reserve is supposed to
16	work is that we're looking at the
17	difference of a noncustodial
18	parent's after-tax income. After
19	child support, he or she should be
20	left with at least the amount of
21	the self-support reserve. Okay?
22	So since West Virginia, like
23	Alabama, bases its guidelines on
24	gross income, they do that little

percent on line ten is to account for taxes. Now, some states, what they'll do is they'll inflate the self-support reserve or use a different gross, a gross equivalent instead. So there's a couple of variations to this if you're going to use it.

One really positive thing about using this method, or I think so -- In my opinion, and this is purely my opinion. You know, it's based on, you know, my ten years of working in this industry. The best thing you can do for a child is two parents that get along. And part of getting along is child support, agreeing to child support.

And when I was doing a case
law review up in Vermont, it was
interesting to have this -- They
have this worksheet here. And
what parents would do, they
would deviate. They would agree

between this amount and this amount. And I attribute it to making it explicit. And they knew that the noncustodial parent was getting a break. And the noncustodial parent probably said, Well, you know, maybe we should work something out. And to me, any time you can get two parents to agree, that's a wonderful thing. That's the first step to having a better child.

If you use the Vermont method or that worksheet, you would have to use a difference schedule.

And that schedule, or at least the first page of that schedule, is going to be different. It's shown in that Appendix III. If you look at the first page, we've got the --these are all the Betson-Rothbarth's now. There is no shaded area. Okay? But if I was to print the second page of this

schedule, it would look exactly
like the one that's in Table 6,
Exhibit 6, and that's the proposed
schedule.

So here is Exhibit 6. You can see the shaded, and then when you go to Appendix III, there it is with the numbers without. And anything between these two amounts is acceptable, I think. These are based on what it costs to raise children. These are all the Betson-Rothbarth measurements. And then the shaded area is with the poverty level incorporated into it. So if you're thinking about doing something a little bit different --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I don't think we've got Appendix VI.

DR. VENOHR: It's in

Appendix III. Here it is. You've got it. Yeah, that's it. This is

just the third page. When you have thirty exhibits --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: We don't have one that looks like that shaded area.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm working with -- I've been working with the District of Columbia, and they have a guideline formula where they disregard the first sixteen thousand five hundred dollars of the custodial parent's (inaudible) plus an additional two thousand dollars for each child. And when I went there -- And then they do a gross percent (inaudible). So when I went there -- It's a different guidelines model than I'm used to working with. We usually do the Income Shares, but we will consult with states that use other guidelines models.

So the first thing I asked them was, you know, If you guys want to get this done, you're

going to have to make a
commitment what guidelines model
you're going to use. So I want to
make sure, because I don't want
to go through this whole process
and have you guys switch
guidelines models on me, because
it's a big deal, you know, because
then you have to go through the
steps again about what
measurements of child-rearing
costs, (unintelligible) guidelines
models, (unintelligible) USDA
measurements, (unintelligible)
measurements. You have to make
that decision regardless of what
guidelines models you're going to
use. So they said, No, no, we're
going to stick with our guidelines
model. So, okay. So I went
back, and I did all the
calculations.

And I went back, gave them
the new schedule based on Dr.
Engel, another schedule based on

Betson-Rothbarth, and another schedule on USDA. But you could just tell they were so uncertain where they wanted to go. So I thought I'd just give them all three schedules based on the current model, and then we'll see.

So we went back and they decided. They picked one. A month later, they said, We didn't really like that, Could you do this and that. And I said okay. So I did another model. Actually, I did about four or five models, and eventually, what it reduced down to was Income Shares. They finally decided that they didn't like that disregard.

And so I guess the reason I'm reminded of this is when you're freaking about how many charts you're flipping at, be glad you're not in D. C. They have at least, you know -- They have at least

fifteen, twenty different
versions. So it could be worse,
you know, if that helps any. And
so now the custodial advocacy
groups are screaming about them
going to Income Shares, so we'll
see if that is accomplished.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. I'm going to move on to adjustment for sharedparenting time. This is Chapter VI. I'm on page 1. And the measurements of children-rearing costs using a schedule that's based on intact families, there's no assumption about shared parenting incorporated into that schedule. There's no assumption. And while we're talking about using measurements of intact families, sometimes I'm asked why we don't use expenditures on single families. And I think a lot of you guys already know that about thirty -- about a third of single-parent families are poor,

```
1
      so we end up with a poverty
2
      schedule. And actually, single-
3
      parent families spend a higher
      proportion of their income or
4
5
      devote a higher proportion of
      their income to child-rearing
6
      costs. So if you were just to
8
      those proportions, it would result
9
      in a higher schedule. And I
10
      should also mention that the
11
      USDA measurements of single-
12
      parent families, we find that
13
      when they do their measurements,
14
      eighty-three percent of single-
15
      parent families and
16
      (unintelligible) have incomes of
17
      less than forty thousand a year.
18
      And so another limiting factor in
19
      using economic data from single-
20
      parent families is that there isn't
21
      enough (unintelligible) income
      for single-parent families to make
22
23
      those schedules. Only seventeen
24
      percent of (inaudible).
```

So moving back to the shared-

25

1	parenting time adjustment. What
2	I mean Shared-parenting time,
3	what I mean by that is shared
4	physical custody or visitation.
5	It means that the child is
6	physically with the other parent,
7	the nonresidential parent, the
8	non-primary custodial parent.
9	The states have different
10	vernacular that they use for that.

And I'm almost done. I think
I've got about ten, fifteen
minutes.

Most states, thirty-four states provide a formula or a deviation factor in the formula. Most of those are Income Shares states.

And it's not surprising given that that was one of the principles of the Advisory Committee.

Fourteen states, including Alabama, offer deviations but do not specify formulas. And then there's three states that don't even address shared-parenting

t i m e.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And this just shows a map. This is a map right out of that Chapter VI. And what this map suggests to me is that may be (inaudible) has a better chance in the South because there's obviously something in common that these states have deviations but no formula for shared parenting, and so do these states. I have no idea why they're clustered in the Northeast and in the South. But you can see that the states that do specify a formula are Midwest, et cetera. Here is our three states that don't have anything.

I want to talk a little bit about the components of a shared-parenting adjustment. First, they do have a threshold for applying the adjustment, and there's two perspectives on this. The first perspective is, When is the

1 custodial parent's cost reduced 2 because the child was in the other 3 home. Can she -- If the child is in the other parents' home, can 4 5 she rent out the room? No. 6 mean, probably not. I mean, when does it make a substantial 8 reduction in her cost that you can 9 adjust for it? And states usually 10 set that threshold at twenty to 11 thirty-five percent. There are 12 some states that set it more to 13 equal, like Nebraska, Kansas. 14 They don't permit it until it's 15 nearly equal. A few states -- and 16 this is the newest trend -- set it 17 at -- and this is a different perspective -- at as little as two 18 19 to four overnights per year. 20 it's very small. Arizona is a 21 case in point where it's just an 22 adjustment for even food. It's 23 like a one percent adjustment. So 24 in developing a formula, this is 25 an important consideration, when

is that adjustment going to kick in.

In addition -- I don't have this written out. Another factor is how are you going to define it. Is it going to be based on actual visitation? Is it going to be based on court-ordered visitation? Is it going to be based on -- agreed to by the parties? Most guidelines state it's either in the order -- it's a time-sharing order or it's in the parenting plan or agreed to by the parties. That's when they're eligible for the adjustment.

And then we also have to get into the issue of how are we going to define overnights, you know (unintelligible). In Arizona, I ran into problems on a complicated case where the child was split between the mother and the father. And the father worked nights so, you know -- and

the mother worked the other shift. So it was -- You know, they wrote the Code around it.

And if you look at what Arizona has proposed right now, it's very complicated. It's on their website. But they do a very refined definition of overnights to get at that issue.

So another factor that you've got to consider -- again, this is all in Chapter VI -- is the adjustment method. And the most common used approach is a cross-credit. And I'm going to show you an example now. There's four states that use the Indiana approach or a variation of the Indiana approach. And there is nine states that are just all over the map as far as what they use.

California embeds their
parenting-time adjustment right
into their guidelines. They start
with the presumption that the

noncustodial parent may have the child twenty percent of the time.

And they'll upwards adjust if it's less than twenty percent, and they'll downwards adjust if it's more than twenty percent.

Michigan actually does my favorite formula. And they proposed my even most favorite formula, but it's cubed. It's to the third power. So, you know, unless you're into it like me, you probably don't want to calculate that out each time. But the results are beautiful as far as it's a nice, graduated increase as parenting time increases.

So those are some of the oddball things. I'm going to talk more about the cross-credit and the Indiana approach.

A third component is a multiplier. Most states with a shared-parenting adjustment include a multiplier, and that's

to account for child-rearing
expenditures that are duplicated
between the two sets of
households, such as housing and
transportation. New Jersey may
include housing (inaudible).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is on page VI-4. This just walks through the crosscredit adjustment for time sharing. And here we go through the regular calculations. We start off with the parents' income, and we've prorated it. And we look at the basic obligation on the schedule. Here on this line, we multiply it by fifty percent to account for those duplicated expenditures. So the parents are going to share in that duplicated expense, how much it now costs. It costs more to raise a child in two households than it does to raise a child in one household. So they're going to share that combined amount.

20

21

22

23

24

25

In this scenario, we have parents that have equal time. So here, we took each parent's prorated share based on their income. Now, the next step is we look at their time division. And then the cross-credit approach comes by taking each parent's share, and you multiply it by the amount of time the child has with the other parent. And that's what that parent owes that other parent. You do the same thing for the other parent and multiply it, and you can do it this way, too. It's showing the remaining amount.

So you do the regular basic -You do the regular calculation,
and then you prorate it by the
parents' time. You balance by
the time, and then you offset it.
And the difference is the child
support obligation. And then
from here, you could do your

regular stuff for child care and so forth and extraordinary medical expenses that (inaudible).

This is the Arizona approach, and it's come full circle as far as the methodology. It's -- The basis of it, there was a judge in Indiana back in the early nineties -- I think it was -- Judge Vaughn. And this came from Indiana originally, so it's kind of funny that Indiana just adopted the shared-parenting formula recently. And what Judge Vaughn did was he grouped child-rearing expenditures into three categories.

Variable, which means food mostly, and variable costs can be shifted from one parent to the other. You know, if the child is with the noncustodial parent on the weekend, there is food cost, and then you shift them back.

And the second category is called --

(Whereupon, Videotape 3 ended, and Videotape 4 began with Dr. Venohr continuing as follows:)

DR. VENOHR: This is from Exhibit 23, and the additional-dependents adjustment is permissive in nine states, including Alabama. It's presumptive in twenty-four states, meaning that it doesn't have to be judicial discretion. It's on the worksheet there.

The most common form of time formula is to subtract the dummy order from the parent's income, and that's similar to what's done in Alabama's guidelines. And by that, I mean that you take the parent's income and, if there's one additional dependent and that parent's income is a thousand dollars, you look at the schedule,

figure out what the support order
would be for that one child, and
you subtract that amount from the
parent's income before
determining support for the
children that you are (inaudible).
Alabama uses this approach.

A few states multiply that
dummy order by seventy-five
percent, and that has a
mathematical effect in equalizing
the support between the two sets
of children.

And for some states, they take the philosophy first born -- you know, kind of like mortgage principals, you know, first in first out (inaudible), however you want to phrase it.

In other states, they believe that, you know, there shouldn't be a distinction between the first born and the second born as far as the sets of children. And, obviously, if you're taking that

1 dollar amount off the obligor's 2 income -- the obligee's income 3 because it would be applicable to the obligee, that that first child 4 5 -- the first child would be 6 subtracted to have a priority, a greater share of income than the second children. 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So seventy-five percent in the dummy order tends to equalize it. And there's a couple of states, South Carolina, West Virginia --I think it is -- that use that seventy-five percent multiplier.

I have been fascinated with additional-dependents adjustment lately, so that's probably why you have the long table that you do in Chapter VI, that Exhibit 22. And I'll tell you why.

It's that I've been working with Tennessee lately. And I think it was a year ago. The Tennessee guidelines were

25 constitutionally challenged, and it had to do with additional
 dependents. Tennessee was the
 only state to explicitly exclude
 adjustments for additional
 dependents.

And by additional dependents, I'm talking about children that are not covered by child support orders. So, you know, it could be that the noncustodial parent remarried and had other children or -- who knows -- they had an affair when they were still with, you know, their wife, or there's a child support order for children outside, you know, the marriage, et cetera. There are all sorts of situations that could occur.

Well, Tennessee was the only state that explicitly excluded any sort of adjustments for that. So it made it all the way up to the Supreme Court of Tennessee, you know, equal protection, blah, blah, blah (inaudible). And they

did find that that violated the constitutional stuff, and I have the case if you want it.

But what did happen after that is that the legislation was just outraged -- the legislature was just outraged by this whole lawsuit. There is a lot of anger about it because it takes a lot of state resources to be sued like that.

And so they said, Oh, we're just going to make you guys do an additional-dependent adjustment.

So they did, and they ended up with a six-page adjustment for additional dependents. There is a provision for E kids, F kids, G kids. And that's the only way you can refer to it because E kids are kids that were covered by a child support order. F kids are kids in the home that are not covered by a child support order.

G kids are those that are not in

the home and not covered by a

child support order but could be

covered by a child support order

later.

So I've been trying to work with them. And I think I've convinced Tennessee to do this, that they need to get rid of that six pages and make it a simple adjustment. So I just had to look at every single nuance there is about how additional dependents (inaudible) in other states because, you know, I hadn't even thought about it before.

A lot of states are now recognizing that. A lot of states only permit the adjustment for children in the home, additional dependents in the home. They don't permit it for children that are additional dependents that are outside the home.

So I've learned all sorts of little nuances like this. So

that's the detail in Exhibit 22 and -- or 23. And the things that I want to just bring up to you is that the adjustment is usually available to either parent. There are a couple of states out there that still only make it applicable to the noncustodial parent. But, you know, what's good for the goose is good for the gander. So most states take that attitude.

Most states specify that a change in additional dependents alone is not (inaudible) is not a change in circumstances that can be used for a review of the child support or child support modification. There is a handful of states that, you know, limit it to five or more children, you know, that they won't do it -- they won't do the adjustment for subsequent children.

And Pennsylvania's approach is considered a policy practice.

I wrote up -- I wrote it up where
we had this (inaudible) with the
Federal Office of Child Support
Enforcement about best practices
for handling a low-income
custodial parent. And my Federal
Project Officer just loved
Tennessee's approach.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What it does -- It's not a very practical approach, though. But what it does is it looks at all the children in the orders, and then it adds it up, adds (unintelligible). And they'll do dummy orders if there's children in the home. If that total exceeds fifty percent of the obligor's net income, which is the CCPA, the Consumer Credit Protection Act amount, then they'll go back and adjust all those orders downward so it -proportionally so they just equal fifty percent of the obligor's net income.

And the reason that the

Federal Project Officer liked it

so much is because it really

respects the CCPA amount, but it

also acknowledges that if the

noncustodial parent has the

ability to pay all these child

support orders, then, you know,

he or she should pay them.

So that's why it's considered a policy practice. And I think -- I'm surprised I don't see judges and attorneys going, Go back and modify all those orders. It's -- Practically, it's not very practical.

So, finally, break time is coming, I think. The conclusions, and these are in Chapter VII. And, again, I appreciate your patience. Like I said, usually it takes a day to go through all this stuff.

Number one, we recommend updating the schedule to the most

```
1
      current economic factors. Two, I
2
      recommend reviewing the
3
      (unintelligible) the self-support
4
      reserve and the minimum support
5
      orders. We put in seven forty-
6
      eight a month, which is the
      poverty level for 2003, and
8
      minimum orders of fifty dollars,
9
      reviewing that again to think
10
      about whether you're going to
11
      incorporate it into the schedule
12
      or worksheet. Again, that's a
13
      policy decision. If you're going
14
      to update the schedule, the third
15
      point is that you'll want to
16
      update your definition of
17
      extraordinary medical expenses to
18
      include two hundred and fifty
      dollars per year per child because
19
20
      that's consistent with the
21
      proposed schedule. The fourth
22
      thing is that it might be
23
      beneficial to do a shared-
24
      parenting adjustment and give
25
      more predictability to order
```

1 amounts if there is a formula 2 included. And the final point is 3 that you might want to equalize support to subsequent children by 4 5 using the seventy-five percent 6 (inaudible). So thank you. 8 JUDGE GOSA: Before we open 9 for questions, we have three 10 committee members that weren't 11 here yesterday. I'll let y'all 12 introduce yourselves and tell us 13 where you're from and what you 14 do, please. 15 COMMITTEE MEMBER: My 16 name is Steve Wright. I'm from 17 Birmingham, Alabama. Мy

practice is limited to a domestic relations practice.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm Drew Whitmire, Birmingham, also. I do about eighty percent adoptions, and I do -- I've done a lot of divorces.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gordon

1 Bailey. I'm in private practice in Anniston, and I think I've been 2 3 involved in child support court since 1976. 4 JUDGE GOSA: Thank you. 5 6 Let's take about a fifteen-minute break, and then we'll open it for questions. 8 9 (Whereupon, a brief recess 10 was had, after which 11 Videotape 4 was restarted 12 with a committee member 13 already in progress as 14 f o 1 1 o w s :) 15 COMMITTEE MEMBER: 16 self-support reserve break and 17 one of the examples that was 18 shown, and I think that's very problematic. 19 20 DR. VENOHR: Yeah. There 21 isn't any state right now that has 22 a self-support reserve in the 23 schedule for the custodial parent.

There are a couple of ways that

you can do that.

24

1 And the reason that they don't 2 is because it's -- you could 3 subtract a self-support reserve from both parents' income, but 4 5 after you do all the calculations, you're still going to end up with 6 situations where the noncustodial 8 parent's income is going to be 9 above -- the noncustodial parent 10 -- the child support order would 11 be greater than the self-support 12 reserve and -- Let me say that 13 one more time. Excuse me. And I 14 think I actually have a graph somewhere that I'll look for 15 16 later. Is that you could subtract 17 self-support reserve from each 18 parent's income before the calculations of support, but by 19 20 the time you get down to the 21 bottom line, after you do all the 22 calculations of prorating and 23 stuff, you could end up with an 24 order amount that is greater than 25 the difference between the

noncustodial parent's income and the self-support reserve.

So the only way to do it, if you really want to protect the integrity of that self-support reserve mathematically, is to do it at the very bottom, the last calculation, and not consider the custodial parent's income. But it does create a policy that this is our policy decision in that the noncustodial parent's needs come first before the children's or, you know, the custodial parent's.

And there are a couple of states, what they've done -- and it's a very complicated method of how they arrived at it. And it's -- South Dakota did this. When we looked at the noncustodial parent's income after taxes, because, you know, there's different tax consequences depending on how you claim children, we looked at the

```
1
      custodial parent's tax
      consequences. We started with
2
3
      the assumption -- And it was easy
      to do this in South Dakota
4
5
      because they have a presumption
6
      that each parent is capable of
      earning minimum wage, and if
8
      they're not, they have to provide
9
      evidence that they're either
10
      disabled or caring for somebody.
11
      So we started with the assumption
12
      that the parent was making
13
      minimum wage and that the
14
      custodial parent is claiming the
15
      tax deduction for the children,
16
      the noncustodial parent is only
17
      claiming themselves. We figured
18
      out what their after-tax income
19
      was and, of course -- and then the
20
      custodial parent is going to have
21
      a higher after-tax income because
22
      of the difference in tax
23
      consequences. And then we
24
      compared each of those to the
25
      poverty level, and then we
```

determined what the minimum orders would be, assuming that these parents had equal income, equal relative to their poverty level.

So in South Dakota, that
worked out to be a minimum order
of about a hundred for one child,
and it was a hundred and fifty for
two children. And then we
gradually took forty percent -- or
was it fifty percent -- until we
worked into the new schedule.

So if you wanted to -- In short, what I'm saying is, if you wanted to consider the custodial parent's income and poverty level of the custodial parent and the children, something like South Dakota's approach would probably be more appropriate than trying to do a subtraction from the worksheet, because the worksheet -- It's just not going to work mathematically.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Could 2 you send us that? 3 DR. VENOHR: Yes. And I might even have it on a screen. 4 5 I'll look for it. Because it's 6 come up somewhere before. I'll see if I've got it in my laptop. 8 But I'll send you South Dakota's, 9 and I'll also send you an example 10 of why it doesn't work when you 11 subtract it on both sides. 12 COMMITTEE MEMBER: 13 proposed schedule, though, in 14 Chapter III, it does have that 15 built in --16 DR. VENOHR: Right. 17 COMMITTEE MEMBER: -- the 18 schedule. 19 DR. VENOHR: That shaded 20 area has that seven hundred and 21 forty-eight built in, and the 22 reason we did that was that the 23 existing schedule has that four 24 forty-seven built in. So we were

just taking the same steps only

using more updated economic data.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: One
way to make it more obvious
would be to say in the Rule that
it's incorporated.

DR. VENOHR: And some states do that. You know, they --Pennsylvania has a shaded area, and they say in their rules --Nobody knows what it means. They actually call it -- This is kind of a funny story, and I probably shouldn't say this. But it's Friday, and I'm getting tired. They call their selfsupport reserve CAM, and they call it Computable Allowable Minimum. But really, what they're making fun of is WAM, which is Walking Around Money that the legislators get. They call this Crawling Around Money.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have

I guess it's an observation, and

you can tell me if I'm wrong.

I've never heard of any approach
that considers the in-kind care
that the custodial parent gives

5 the child.

And, for example, if the custodial parent provided only six hours a day only twenty days a month in-kind care -- I'm talking about 2:00 a.m. feedings, all those things that parents have to do to raise a child -- at minimum wage, that's six hundred and eighteen dollars a month in-kind care. And I've never heard any model that even addresses that. Am I correct?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. You know, there's a little bit of an element of that in the D. C.Massachusetts guidelines that uses a disregard on the first twenty thousand, and I think in Massachusetts, it was sixteen thousand five hundred, because

they wanted to credit -- give an opportunity for the (inaudible) to take care of the children. You know, that was -- If you read some of the background information, you know, (inaudible), and that was one of the reasons.

You know, D. C. really struggled with whether to recommend getting rid of that custodial parent disregard. What they really were trying to do was to (inaudible).

And they're getting a lot of flack from it. The American Legal -- Law Institute, excuse me, they have a guidelines (inaudible), though they don't explicitly say (inaudible) they want -- they covered, you know, when the child -- the parenting time (inaudible) caring for the children and definitely are more advocates of the D. C. and

Massachusetts approach. So I
think the American Law Institute
would probably be the closest.
And it does result in higher
orders.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have
a question. (Inaudible.) If you

a question. (Inaudible.) If you would, please explain to me how Alabama -- how this new proposal that you have based on your new updated charts -- To take an example, low income parents that's on minimum wage of five dollars and fifteen cents. Put that into our charts and tell me how much money does the noncustodial parent have left after he's paid his child support.

DR. VENOHR: That's probably going to be may be about fifty bucks.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Fifty dollars left after he pays his child support?

DR.VENOHR: Oh, no. I'm

1 sorry. That's the order. The 2 order, you know, is going to be 3 on the self-support reserve. Let's see. That's after-tax 4 5 income. COMMITTEE MEMBER: As I 6 understand it, the self-support 8 reserve is figured into --9 DR. VENOHR: Right. 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER: -- your 11 proposal. And if that is true, the 12 way my figures calculate, he's 13 going to have seventy-two dollars 14 a week left to spend after he pays 15 his child support. You've got 16 this guy living under a bridge. 17 You might as well tie a rope 18 around his neck and push him off 19 the bridge. With seventy-two 20 dollars a week, he's not going to 21 be able to survive DR. VENOHR: No, he's 22 23 actually going to have more than 24 that if he's at minimum wage.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm

looking at your chart. At minimum wage, he's going to have

DR. VENOHR: If you look at this chart -- and maybe I can -- I've got it -- No, I don't have it on the screen. It's on page III-11. And if you have a minimum wage obligor --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What page is it?

DR. VENOHR: It's III-11,
Roman number III-11. And I
think this is a really good
question because it ties into what
should order amounts be in low
income cases. And this affects a
lot of parenting. And I'm going
to pull out -- I've got a copy of
the -- I'm going to pull out my
Rule 32 because I think these are
really worth comparing. And it's
going to help decide what to do
with low incomes to see this.

And the reason it's so important

is that -- I know some of you guys work with taxes; some of you don't. And I apologize that (unintelligible) is that in TANF cases, it's not uncommon to impute at minimum wage if you don't know the noncustodial parent's income, and so it's a really critical juncture. COMMITTEE MEMBER: Could

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Could you include (inaudible)? Would that help?

DR. VENOHR: Actually, that might be a better one.

COMMITTEE MEMBER:

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. That's actually -- Thank you. Boy, you've been looking at this stuff, haven't you? Thank you. It's on page V-4. And minimum wage would be approximately nine hundred dollars a month at five fifteen per hour at forty hours per week, four point three three

1 weeks per month. And for nine 2 hundred under the existing 3 Alabama schedule -- and I think this is for two kids -- it's two 4 5 hundred and fifty-nine dollars a 6 month. And for the proposed Alabama schedule, it would be 8 either fifty dollars minimum 9 order or the court discretion. 10 And you can see that also -- See 11 this here, right here, and you can 12 also see it in this exhibit. Right 13 there we didn't (inaudible). 14 COMMITTEE MEMBER: How 15 did you arrive at the monthly

income at minimum wage?

DR. VENOHR: I took five fifteen an hour times four three three times forty. So it's going to be about eight hundred and ninety-two dollars, and since the Alabama (inaudible) rounds it up, it would be about nine hundred.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: (Inaudible.) Is this presently

24

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 discretionary?

DR. VENOHR: No, but we're recommending that that's discretionary or that fifty dollar order. It's really up to you guys. (Inaudible) moved up to what that -- the increase in the self-support reserve.

COMMITTEE MEMBER:

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Could I

-- I'm still not real clear on

that. On the very back of your

book, I think -- I don't know

what appendix that is. Some of

your pages are not marked very

clear. I'm having a hard time

following. I guess it's Appendix

V. As I understand it, this is the

proposed schedule that you would

intend?

DR. VENOHR: No, this is a comparison of existing and proposed. This column is existing, and this column is

proposed. So you can look at the difference in the schedules. This is the amounts. This is the dollar change. If you were to express that as a percentage, if you took this column and divided that column, that would be -
COMMITTEE MEMBER: So

COMMITTEE MEMBER: So
your proposed column is here, and
this is what you're proposing that
we raise our guidelines figure to.

DR. VENOHR: If it's a raise.

If it's a negative, then it's a decrease.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Okay.

Based on my figures, at the income level of two parents earning minimum wage, the father's child support share is two hundred and forty-two dollars a month.

DR. VENOHR: Oh, I know what you did wrong. Here, I'll show you. It's that we assume the shaded area. This is --

1

2

3

4

5

67

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

21

20

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Both of them at minimum is eighteen hundred. And it's three seventy, and half of that is a hundred thirty-five -- a hundred and eighty-five dollars a month.

DR. VENOHR: Yes. But if you use the shaded area, then you're only using his income.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well, I can see this -- by this we need a much simpler method of calculating child support. I don't think anybody really understands what's going on. These charts here are nice to look at, but they really don't explain the truth. When you get down here to the rubber meeting the road and you're making out your child support obligation sheet and you come up and find out that your noncustodial parent has seventy-two dollars a month -- a

week to live on, something is

severely wrong with that. Now, it is the position in Alabama that both parents are to be involved in the child's life. There is no way that the noncustodial parent can have anything to do with either of his children if he has seventy-two dollars a week left after paying the child support obligation.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: The same principle applies to the custodial parent, plus the custodial parent is providing, with my figures, at least two hundred and forty hours a month care. I mean, that's --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: If you take from the noncustodial parent and give it to the custodial parent, her income rises dramatically --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Hers
doesn't. Hers doesn't. This
discussion is not addressing the
child's needs. That's what we're

1 here about.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well, 3 that's true.

> COMMITTEE MEMBER: If a percentage -- If we had the minimum wage noncustodial, what is the percentage if the custodial parent is having a similar or slightly higher salary? Do you have any idea? I assume they are both making equal amounts because that's just the way they are. So what he's saying is --What I'm saying is you still have a child to deal with. Both are probably making close to minimum wage. So fifty dollars a month is not going to make or break either one of them, but it will make a big difference to that child.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. And you're asking if I have any case data on --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Is it usually reflected they're both

1 making very close in salaries? 2 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Where are you coming up with this fifty 3 4 dollars a months child support 5 obligation? COMMITTEE MEMBER: If we 6 shaded it -- It's fifty flat for 8 under one thousand. If he's 9 making minimum (inaudible), 10 obviously it's a fifty dollar a 11 month child support --12 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm 13 sorry, sir, but you're not looking 14 at the proposed table. 15 (Whereupon, several people 16 began speaking 17 simultaneously.) COMMITTEE MEMBER: Yes, I 18 am. Look at Exhibit 6. 19 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Look at 21 the proposed table at the back of 22 the book. 23 COMMITTEE MEMBER: That's 24 the non-shaded. 25 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well,

1 it's already been stated that the 2 self-support reserve is figured 3 into this. When it comes down to 4 the actual figures that you plug 5 in, right here they are, right 6 there on the back page. COMMITTEE MEMBER: Those 8 are proposed. They are separate

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

proposals. But is there a similar

DR. VENOHR: Yes. I think I'll address your question. I think when I leave it with you guys and I'm not here -- But I think right now it's better to use my time for -- I mean, it sounds like there needs to be some education here.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: In other words, you don't really have an answer for me.

DR. VENOHR: No, I do. I did give you the answer, that we propose the shaded area. And it sounds like -- I'm getting the

impression that most people
understand it. But it sounds like
we -- I can either spend the time
helping you understand it right
now, or else I can answer his
question. And it's really up to
your discretion what you want me
to do.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Maybe you can help me. Which one of these proposals do you propose for us, Alabama, to use?

DR. VENOHR: What we proposed is on Exhibit 6 with the shaded area, meaning that the obligor's income, if it falls in the shaded area, you calculate support based on the obligor's income only.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: So we really don't need this table in the back. Don't even look at that.

DR. VENOHR: I think you'll probably want to look at it later.

1 It's important for looking at what 2 it does to middle income levels 3 and higher income levels. If you're looking at -- If you want 4 5 to calculate all the order amounts 6 by yourself, look at Exhibit 6 and use the shaded area. If you just 8 want a side-by-side comparison, 9 that's why we put that last 10 appendix in there. COMMITTEE MEMBER: So 11 12

COMMITTEE MEMBER: So
we're going to increase some
parents' obligation by as much as
thirty-two percent?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. VENOHR: That's -- No, it's not an obligation. It's a basic obligation. That's the schedule. It's not what the increase of the order amount is. I want to address your question. I'm sorry. What was your name?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Drew Whitmire.

DR. VENOHR: Drew. I want to apologize. There's too many

```
1
      people -- too many nice people
2
      I've met. Drew -- And I'll get to
3
      your question in a second. I just
      need -- I mean, I need to be
4
5
      respectful of everybody's
6
      questions and time. And I
      apologize if I'm not moving quick
8
      enough. But we have done some
9
      case file reviews as far as, you
10
      know, we -- I've done case file
      reviews in Arizona and
11
12
      Pennsylvania, and D. C. recently.
13
      I haven't done any in the
14
      southern states. And in D. C., we
15
      really did look at that issue as
16
      far as what their incomes are.
17
      And I might have some statistics
18
      somewhere in here. But usually,
19
      if we have income data and it's
20
      not imputed, parents are more
21
      likely to be above minimum wage.
22
      I mean, it's not surprising
23
      minimum wage is five fifteen an
24
      hour. And even, like, in
25
      Alabama, the service sector
```

```
1
      industries are more like eight
2
      dollars, I think, in (inaudible).
3
      So it worked out to -- I think,
4
      it's eight dollars, seven an hour.
5
      And minimum wage hasn't been
6
      updated since -- I think it's been
7
      '97 or '95, and there has been
8
      talk about updating it. So first,
9
      they're usually going to have
10
      income above that, and in
11
      Washington, D. C., as far as the
12
      cases, we're sending cases where
13
      the CP had greater than an NCP.
14
      As I say, at the low incomes, it
15
      was may be ten to fifteen to
16
      twenty percent of the caseload.
      Now D. C. I wouldn't say is the
17
18
      norm. It's an exceptional
      caseload. And why -- What
19
20
      happens is, it's really hard to get
21
      an order established, and so who
22
      they usually establish orders for
23
      are the people in the system that
24
      they can find through -- you
25
      know, that are employed and all.
```

So they get a lot of people that

actually work for the Metro for

the -- And so I think they have

probably a disproportionate

amount where the custodial parent

makes more. And I can look. I

can --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I was just trying to compare. What we're arguing is what the child's hidden dollars are so a small amount should not be given to the custodial parent. I was just thinking the custodial parent probably doesn't make a whole lot more than the noncustodial --

DR. VENOHR: Right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: -- in our state specifically.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah, it's

probably -- Yeah, I think in D. C.

there's probably a higher

proportion of mothers that are

working. It's a little distorted,

I think. And that's why I'm

(inaudible).

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Doctor,

I think probably we should use or
look at using the guidelines if
we're going to be using Exhibit
6, and it precedes the guidelines
on the back page. Probably those
guidelines shouldn't be started
until they got to nineteen hundred
dollars. Because this Exhibit 6,
it takes care of income through
eighteen hundred and fifty
dollars.

DR. VENOHR: I'm sorry. I'm not following your question.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: See,
when you're starting over here it
-- let me start over. Whenever
we were talking about there in
the back where I wasn't -- I don't
have a copy of the study. But
wherever you started on the back
page over there where he was
talking about whatever income
level started at five hundred and

1 fifty dollars, in the back --2 Actually on Exhibit 6, it covers 3 income through eighteen hundred and fifty dollars. So the 4 guidelines in the back probably 5 6 shouldn't even start giving an amount up to that nineteen 8 hundred dollars. 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER: 10 you can do is lap it over like 11 that -- Then you have the shaded 12 area built directly in the 13 guidelines --14 DR. VENOHR: I think you may 15 be missing the second page. COMMITTEE MEMBER: 16 (Inaudible.) 17 18 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Okay. But what I'm saying is flipping 19 20 over -- turning it over to the 21 back of the page wherever Mr. Blackston was getting his 22 23 schedule and had a different 24 number than you did. Possibly

that schedule shouldn't start to

1 where this one ends. 2 DR. VENOHR: Well, it's the same schedule --3 4 COMMITTEE MEMBER: You're talking about overlapping? 5 DR. VENOHR: No. 6 COMMITTEE MEMBER: That's what happens to this whenever we 8 9 overlap, somebody's won't 10 overlap. 11 DR. VENOHR: No, no, no, no, 12 no. You're -- It's confusing. 13 And, gosh, I wish I had an extra copy of the report because if I 14 15 had one, may be it would really 16 help. It's that there's no difference as the shaded method 17 18 that we're talking about. That's the reason. The schedule is 19 20 exactly the same between those 21 two, but it's a use of the shaded 22 area. 23 COMMITTEE MEMBER: It's 24 just not shaded on the back.

(Whereupon, several people

began speaking simultaneously.)

COMMITTEE MEMBER: The numbers in the shaded area are the only difference between the proposed schedule and the shaded schedule. So what you do is you go to the shaded schedule, and you plug that into the schedule in the back.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I think it's already plugged in on the proposed.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. But I
think one thing that you've got to
remember when you're looking at
that last schedule is this is a
schedule. These are not order
amounts. Okay? So you have to
think --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I just have two or three quick questions that I would like to address, and I don't want to take up everybody's time. But I

1 understand these figures. Exactly 2 where did these figures in the 3 schedule come from? I mean, I 4 understand being about Betson and Rothbarth. 5 6 DR. VENOHR: You got it. COMMITTEE MEMBER: Okay. 8 Now, where did Betson and 9 Rothbarth get their numbers? 10 DR. VENOHR: Dr. Betson used 11 the Rothbarth methodology, and 12 he applied it -- Let me pull out 13 that slide, if you want. 14 (Whereupon, several people 15 began speaking 16 simultaneously.) 17 DR. VENOHR: No, you know, 18 obviously if you have a question, there's some confusion, and we 19 20 should address it. Okay. I think 21 this is -- I think it's an 22 important question, and you 23 should be really clear about this. I mean, it's really, really 24

25

important.

24

25

economist. He's a Professor of Economics at the University of Notre Dame. He conducted a study. It was requested by Congress. Okay? And what he used is '80-'86 data and that's --I don't have that written on the slide, but it's called the Consumer Expenditure Survey data. And it's conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and they surveyed eight thousand (inaudible) ethnic households per year. Right now this includes six And so Betson aggregated that data for all those years, and then he does his measurements. Не applies what's called the Rothbarth methodology to estimate child-rearing costs. And I have a copy of his report. I can loan it --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: That's

1 -- I mean, I've just -- I've got a 2 couple of maybe -- I might have a 3 misconception and all on what I've read and what I understand. 4 DR. VENOHR: Well, that's 5 okay. That's why I'm here. 6 COMMITTEE MEMBER: But my understanding was that Betson's 8 9 work was in '88, which was just 10 an update of Espenshade's work 11 (inaudible) based on Consumer 12 Expenditure Survey. 13 DR. VENOHR: He used --COMMITTEE MEMBER: That 14 15 was collected from 1980 to '86, 16 and Espenshade's work was 17 actually not valid in calculating 18 child support awards. 19 DR. VENOHR: Why? 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER: 21 Because he didn't have the proper 22 data whenever he gathered his 23 information. He was a Sociology professor. He wasn't an 24

25

economist.

1 DR. VENOHR: He's an 2 economist. 3 COMMITTEE MEMBER: And he 4 didn't -- Well, that's what I'm 5 saying. I --6 DR. VENOHR: You know, I wish I had a copy of his book. 8 It's called Investing in Children, 9 and it was funded by the National 10 Institute for Health. Espenshade 11 was with the Urban Institute when 12 he did that, and it's very 13 extensive. I mean, if you -- This is Betson, and you can see all 14 15 sorts of tables and graphs and 16 numbers. I mean, Espenshade's 17 work is -- it probably has less 18 equations, you know, than Betson's. But it's --19 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm 20 21 still not clear on that fact that 22 he actually did -- That all the

still not clear on that fact that
he actually did -- That all the
information I've seen was that
Espenshade never intended his
work to be used in child support

23

24

1 guidelines.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. VENOHR: And you know what I would recommend doing is going to the library and checking out Espenshade because it does say that, you know -- There is some discussion there about why NIH funded it, and it's for child support and foster care. I mean, I think it's worth just going to the source and seeing it for yourself, you know. And they should have it at, you know, libraries and stuff. And, I mean -- And if you can't find it, I can certainly photocopy the pages.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well,

I've got information (inaudible).

I just haven't seen anything to

contradict the fact that he wasn't

trying to come up with

information to be used in child

support guidelines.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. I think you should look at the book, or

1 I'll photocopy the books --2 Espenshade's book, those pages 3 on that for you. So, you know, 4 that's -- Always go to the 5 primary source. 6 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Right. 7 And I'm still under the belief 8 that if we're basing all of 9 Betson-Rothbarth's work off of 10 Espenshade's work, then it 11 doesn't meet federal requirements 12 in compliance with the child 13 support guidelines. 14 DR. VENOHR: Well, two 15 things. I think still you need to 16 look at Espenshade who's work is It's credible. And then 17 valid. 18 Betson didn't base his work on 19 Espenshade. 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I 21 thought while ago you were saying 22 that they did base their work on 23 continuing -- on a continuation of

DR. VENOHR: They are two

Espenshade's work.

24

- 151 1 separate studies. Now, 2 Espenshade used the Engel 3 estimator and so did Betson. But 4 they are two different economists. They're two 5 6 different studies. And Betson's work was --8 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well --9 DR VENOHR: I'm sorry. I 10 have to say one more thing. And 11 Betson's work was independent --12 Betson's work is published in 13 this study, and it's reviewed by 14 the Lewin Group, by an 15 independent group. 16 JUDGE GOSA: Next question. 17 18 like to clarify -- I'd like to
 - COMMITTEE MEMBER: I would clarify my question I had there. I think that where we got off the track with my question earlier was we assumed that the father or the noncustodial was the only one who had income. My example was that both parents were low income

19

20

21

22

23

24

earners. They were bringing income up to eighteen hundred dollars a month. What would be the noncustodial parent's share in that case?

DR. VENOHR: If we use the shaded area, the order amount would be fifty dollars. If you don't use the shaded area on that, it would be whatever amount you said it was.

add both incomes together, that
brings the minimum child support
obligation up to three hundred
and seventy dollars for one child.

It would be five hundred and
twenty dollars for two children.

You assume that most people have
two children. So his total
obligation is going to be five
hundred and twenty dollars. That
makes the noncustodial parent
paying considerably more. And I
believe I heard you say earlier

1	that in cases where the
2	noncustodial custodial parent's
3	income goes up, then the actual
4	noncustodial parent's obligations
5	goes down. Well, that doesn't
6	seem to hold true for this
7	example.
8	COMMITTEE MEMBER:
9	(Inaudible.)
10	DR. VENOHR: Go to the
11	graphs for obligor income,
12	obligee income (inaudible). Do
13	you want me to go through that
14	part of the presentation again?
15	COMMITTEE MEMBER:
16	(Inaudible.)
17	DR. VENOHR: Could I use one
18	thousand, or is that other number
19	special?
20	COMMITTEE MEMBER: I
21	believe the example we were
22	already working with was nine
23	hundred dollars a month for two
24	parents.
25	DR. VENOHR: Well,

apparently, I skipped it on here.

But if the obligor's income falls into the shaded area, then you only use the obligor's income.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What you're saying is it's irrelevant then what the custodial parent makes.

DR. VENOHR: Right, right.

And that's to protect the selfsupport reserve. So when you go
to the graphs, which are in

Appendix IV, you can do one
child, equal income. So you have
a minimum wage example of nine
hundred. The order used to be
one forty-seven, and the proposed
order is fifty.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: How did you -- What was your recommendation on -- I think it would be a question about whether we do these things by guidelines. I think what a lot of us in Alabama gets (inaudible) is just

1	what we were talking about where
2	you showed us a chart over there
3	a while ago where you're saying
4	you use a net already. But what
5	the general public sees is gross,
6	and you say you have a hidden
7	income you have a hidden
8	column over there. And I think
9	that's where we get into trouble,
10	when we start trying to hide
11	things and all there from, you
12	know, the public. So I've learned
13	I didn't know the chart was
14	based on net and that So I
15	think Do you recommend that
16	what We're talking about a lot
17	of discretionary or not
18	discretionary, but a lot of
19	(unintelligible) over here. Do
20	you and your company recommend
21	that they be included in the
22	worksheet?
23	DR. VENOHR: I don't think
24	we have any firm opinions on

gross versus net. I think there's

-

1

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm not 3 talking about gross versus net. I'm talking about -- Let's say 4 5 like the self-support reserve that 6 you say is being calculated into the table, but (unintelligible) 8 talking about when is the 9 custodial parent's costs were 10 used and how much visitation. 11 And on the flipside, we've got to 12 look at when is the noncustodial 13 costs incurred, which is the time 14 that they pick them up. Actually, 15 the time that they go pick them 16 up, they're burning gas to go pick 17 them up, which I don't want to be 18 picky. All I can relate to is personal situations where when 19 20 my children come to my house, 21 they have all got a bedroom and 22 they've all got closets and 23 clothes there. We don't swap 24 clothes back and forth. They all 25 -- We got into a -- as you said a

1 while ago, arguing over Play 2 Stations and whose Play Station 3 games. So we just quit all that. 4 If -- God forbid if a hurricane 5 come and blow their mother's 6 home away today, they could come 7 over to the house and start, you 8 know, being without a change in 9 lifestyle and all. But at some 10 point in -- What I'm asking is if 11 we're going to give credit for the 12 time -- the visitation credit or 13 ever how you want to -- parenting 14 credit, ever how you want to talk 15 about it. If we're looking at 16 when the custodial parent's cost 17 begins to go down, we need to 18 look at when the noncustodial parent's starts. And so what I'm 19 20 saying is, is that something that 21 we want to include in the 22 guideline worksheet -- I mean, 23 figure out a way to put it in the 24 worksheet because, you know, one 25 of the things we get around to --

1	and I heard yesterday and I heard
2	a lot of the judges, you know,
3	This goes on in my courtroom.
4	And some of the things I could
5	tell some of the judges were
6	appalled at what was going on in
7	some of the other courtrooms and
8	some we talked about. So we
9	need a more uniformity across
10	that rather than judicial
11	discretion. My discretion might
12	not be your discretion.
13	COMMITTEE MEMBER: She set
14	that out in the presentation.
15	That will be a committee decision
16	whether or not we're going to
17	make policy changes on that.
18	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Okay.
19	DR. VENOHR: Yeah.
20	COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well, I
21	was just asking (unintelligible).
22	DR. VENOHR: Yes, being
23	predictable. Having more

adjustment by adding (inaudible).

1 I'm sure you'll be discussing 2 that. 3 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Can I ask a question about additional 4 5 dependents? I know you had the 6 chart for the various states, which was helpful. But in the 8 proposed chart that we have, at 9 this point there's nothing in 10 there; is that correct? 11 DR. VENOHR: No, no, I 12 didn't do --13 COMMITTEE MEMBER: It's not correct or it is correct? 14 15 DR. VENOHR: There's nothing 16 -- no adjustment in there. 17 COMMITTEE MEMBER: So if 18 we decided we wanted to do something, we can come back as a 19 20 committee and get additional 21 information from you? 22 DR. VENOHR: Sure. And I 23 think you actually have all the 24 information you need.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: But the

1 majority of the states, as I understand, don't make that 2 3 recommendation; is that correct? DR. VENOHR: Well, this is --4 It's permissive in nine states, 5 6 including Alabama, presumptive in twenty-four, and then there is a bunch of states that don't 8 9 address it. And it's done right 10 in the worksheet, and I could get 11 you copies of worksheets that had 12 it. 13 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Does 14 your company -- Are you making a 15 distinction when you say 16 additional dependents between 17 prior-born and subsequent-born? 18 DR. VENOHR: No, no. 19 COMMITTEE MEMBER: That's the confusion. That's the 20 21 confusion. They allow for prior-22 born. That's where the majority 23 is coming from.

DR. VENOHR: Okay. Yeah,

yeah. Thank you for clarifying

24

1 that.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: For after-born children, what's the majority rule?

DR. VENOHR: For after-born, there's only -- I have to -- Sorry, I have to put it in my terms. There's may be three, Colorado, New Mexico, Alabama, Louisiana. There's may be four or five states that limit the adjustment to it's only first-born. And so when you subtract five states from those numbers -- I can calculate them and add them up for you. I just don't have them the way that you asked. But -- Because I think of it backwards, how many states limit it to a prior-born, and there's may be about four or five states.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: On
your chart on IV-11 where you use
seventy-five percent and use the
(inaudible) dummy order, is that

1 what most of the (inaudible) to 2 equalize (inaudible)? 3 DR. VENOHR: (Inaudible.) Yes, equalized --4 5 (Whereupon, several people 6 began speaking simultaneously.) 8 COMMITTEE MEMBER: 9 between the children and where 10 you have adjustments for 11 additional dependents. 12 DR. VENOHR: Yeah, yeah. 13 And this is -- You know, it's just 14 where it fell out mathematically. 15 There's no, you know, loss of 16 any, you know, intuitive thing in 17 there. Just seventy-five percent 18 tends to equal it out; otherwise, the children that are subtracted 19 20 out first, obviously have higher 21 orders (inaudible). 22 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I guess 23 I was going back to your 24 statement that most states 25 prioritize first children, but

some states try to equalize (inaudible).

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. VENOHR: Oh, yeah. Right. That does make it confusing because it's -- Yeah, because -- Boy, now I have to be very careful how I word this. There's -- Let's see. If you look at Exhibit 23, and you look down at Colorado. And it says dummy order for prior-born children living at home, blah, blah, blah. So it doesn't adjust for subsequent children. So that's one issue. And what I did was confuse two issues. So there's one that specifically states in the guidelines it's limited to priorborn children. But then we get to the formula. If you don't do that equalization, it actually favors the prior-born children, and I probably should have worded that sentence a little better to clarify those two points because one

issue is adjustment, whose applicable, and the second issue is when we make that adjustment, the mechanics of the formula, does it favor one set of the children over the other. And I think what I did when I was talking with you, I made it so I confused those two issues for you. They're really separate.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: So as it stands now, is Alabama's model in the norm, which does prioritize first children over second children? Or -- And my second question is, is the trend towards changing that?

DR. VENOHR: I think that the subtraction that's written in the guidelines is the norm, but what's different about Alabama is to limit that to the prior-born. And I understand there's case law that does that, too.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: There's

1 case law that allows us to go outside of the guidelines to 2 3 deviate for after-born children; 4 however, you cannot use the 5 guidelines as the basis for deduction. There's a Court of 6 Civil Appeals case. A lot of 8 them may have allowed some 9 deviation. I've forgotten the 10 case. Some of you practicing 11 attorneys who do it every day --12 But there's a Court of Civil 13 Appeals case that says we can't do the calculation what that 14 15 parent would be paying for this 16 after-born child based on that 17 income and use the guideline 18 figure. $D\ R\ .\quad V\ E\ N\ O\ H\ R\ :\quad A\ n\ d\quad t\ h\ a\ t$ 19

DR. VENOHR: And that
limitation makes Alabama unique.
You know, that's where Alabama
stands alone.

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I
believe I'm confused whenever
you say prior-born. Prior-born

would be under the order anyway,
wouldn't it?
DR. VENOHR: Not

necessarily. And where --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Where would that come into play?

DR. VENOHR: You know, say you have a married man that has an extramarital affair and has another child. So the children in his home that are still living with his wife are prior-born, but they're not under an order. And then they get a child support order for a child that's conceived out of that extramarital affair.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: How would that differ from children of a subsequent marriage? I mean, you still get into children -- The only difference is he had an extramarital affair rather than being remarried.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I think that's for us to address.

1 (Whereupon, several people 2 began speaking

3 simultaneously.)

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I don't think she can address that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: The problem I have with this afterborn is sue is whether or not by rule we can change the substantive law of the state. The rule of law is you can't because it's a substantive rule. Of course, Judge Crawley might be more -- and Justice Stuart would be better at answering that than I But if that's a substantive law in this state, which it is in my opinion, can we change that by rule if the Supreme Court adopts our recommendation? I don't know the answer to that. That's a law school question that I don't know the answer to. Some of you are smarter than I am, but that's a policy decision. Again, I think

1 the committee is going to have to 2 address it. 3 JUDGE GOSA: Are there any more questions? We're right 4 after 12:00. Thank you so much. 5 6 Let me ask the committee, we've scheduled Dr. Rogers after 8 her for thirty minutes. What's 9 the consensus of the committee? 10 Do you want to proceed on or break for lunch? I know some of 11 12 you have to leave. 13 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I would rather hear him now. 14 15 JUDGE GOSA: Is that 16 agreeable to the committee? 17 (Whereupon, several people 18 began speaking 19 simultaneously.) 20 JUDGE GOSA: All right. 21 Blackston, do you want to introduce him? 22 23 JAMES R. BLACKSTON: This 24 is Mark Rogers from Atlanta, 25 Georgia, the Peachtree City area.

1 Well-known in economics. Done 2 studies in states all over the 3 country in helping them decide with their child support 4 guidelines. Mr. Rogers. 5 6 MARK ROGERS: Thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be 8 here. Is it possible to hook my laptop here? 9 10 DR. VENOHR: I can get mine 11 out of there. I was just giving 12 you some space. I'm sorry. 13 You're welcome to use mine, also. 14 MR. ROGERS: It will 15 probably be faster just to swap 16 cables. I'm just basically 17 pushing buttons. 18 DR. VENOHR: I'm sorry. (Whereupon, there was a 19 20 brief pause.) 21 MR. ROGERS: While that's 22 warming up, let me introduce 23 myself. I'm Mark Rogers. I 24 apologize. My voice is not what 25 I would prefer it to be. I'm

recovering from some minor surgery, but I think I can talk thirty minutes. I'm an economist that consults primarily on child support issues as well as macroeconomic issues.

Prior to being a consultant, I was at the Federal Reserve Bank in Atlanta for nineteen years as a forecaster and was appointed to Georgia's Child Support

Commission in 1998. That's how some of my professional interests developed on these issues.

And let me pull up a couple of files. Basically -- I do have some handouts. I'm just going to touch on some bullet points from some Word documents. So we'll just be hitting some highlights.

It never goes as fast as you want it to. All right.

What I do that's a little bit different in terms of discussing child support issues is that I

1 frequently appear in court as an 2 expert witness. And one of the 3 issues has to do with what is the 4 legal context for me going into 5 court and testifying on child cost 6 issues. And basically, I work with the attorneys, and there's 8 one in particular that I work with 9 who's a retired constitutional law 10 professor. And basically, the 11 issue is one of rebuttal, and the 12 issue is that the child support 13 guidelines are rebuttable 14 presumptions. It's a very 15 different concept of treating a 16 guideline as a legal presumption 17 as opposed to a mere policy 18 choice. It's a huge difference. 19 And I may -- I'm beginning to 20 wonder if this is locked up. 21 There are some handouts. I don't 22 know if they're going around. 23 Are they going around? 24 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Yes.

MR. ROGERS: Let's just do

that. And I'm going to jump around because I was originally hired to just provide a very brief critique of the current guidelines, and then later I was asked to offer some commentary on the proposed guidelines. And I really didn't have a lot of time for that, but I have some relevant materials.

And if you turn to page 2 of this document, the brief summary, there are some bullet points relating to federal regulatory requirements, constitutional principles related to child support guidelines. And this is basically the constraining legal issues in terms of how I approach child support guidelines in an economic sense. I always have to go back to, what's at economic issue and how does it fit in in terms of being a legal presumption. And in terms of a

1 legal presumption, there are a 2 number of factors that must apply 3 COMMITTEE MEMBER: 4 (Inaudible.) 5 MR.ROGERS: What?6 COMMITTEE MEMBER: 8 (Inaudible.) 9 MR. ROGERS: I think it's just not very happy juggling too 10 11 many things at one time right 12 now. 13 The issues in terms of a legal presumption, number one, the 14 15 guideline must be based on 16 principle of equal duty of 17 support. 18 Number two, they must be 19 liberally rebuttable. There are a 20 number of issues -- And you 21 probably have to go back where 22 states had facets of their 23 guidelines that are irrebuttable. 24 It violates the principle of

rebuttable presumptions. For

1 example, you may have a 2 presumption that you cannot take 3 into account additional 4 dependents that are not pre-born 5 or first-born. That is an 6 irrebuttable presumption. 7 Probably null and void if 8 challenged. There are other 9 examples of irrebuttable 10 presumptions.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Additionally, a legal presumption cannot be arbitrary. There must be some factual basis. Now, this is in contrast to looking at a guideline as a policy choice. Treating a guideline as a legal presumption has a much higher standard than, We wish, It would be good, in contrast to what is the factual basis, is there an empirical basis. And when I go into court and work with attorneys, my job is to look at the guidelines and then attack all the different components of the

guidelines, whether they're

arbitrary, whether they violate

principle of equal duty of

support, and if it has some

factual basis. So there's a huge

difference between treating a

guideline as a legal presumption

versus just a policy decision.

And there's an additional handout written by the constitutional law professor, retired, who works with me on these kinds of issues.

I'm going to jump around a bit because it just seems logical based on what I've been asked to do since first brought in on this.

I'm going to look at this

document called, Cost Shares:

Child Support Guidelines. Does

everyone have this? Yes?

Maybe? I'm not sure who has the

packet. Is there someone who has
those?

There are two approaches that

I have advocated in terms of the economics in child support guidelines. Those that follow my work are mostly familiar with what I call the Cost Shares approach. It's somewhat different -- It has similar features to the Income Shares, but it does have some different features.

In recent months, I have also adopted the philosophy that Income Shares can be modified to become relatively economically sound. And I believe that the proposal that PSI has brought you today can be adapted. Even if it's not Cost Shares, it can be adapted to meet the legal principles of the legal presumption.

I think this is probably -This is not the best screen.
We're just going to go with the notes.

If you turn to page 7, the bottom of page 7, what I want to do first is give you an overview of the assumptions of the Income Shares guidelines. And it's good to keep in mind how does this conform to requirements for legal presumptions. It's at the bottom of page 7, families in an intact household. It assumes that there is only one house and no additional overhead.

The second bullet point on the next page I'm not going to go into too much detail on. But based on the Betson-Rothbarth methodology, it assumes income that is there that may not actually be there.

The next assumption is the
Income Shares cost schedule does
not take into account the childrelated tax benefit as a cost
offset. That's an important
issue. Income Shares cost table

does not treat the child-related tax benefits as a cost offset.

Continuing, the Income Shares cost table assumes the custodial parent has the child or children all the time. That's the assumption of the cost table.

And the methodology is an indirect methodology comparing income equivalents by looking at household changes and spending on alcohol, tobacco, and adult clothing. I don't need to go into a lot of detail.

And, again, I'm pulling notes
together from other presentations,
so we're going to skip a lot of
things here.

Turn to page 9. Let me just differentiate a little bit about the Cost Shares methodology.

Cost Shares takes data from the U. S. Department of Agriculture, plus data from the Department of the Interior on housing costs.

And it does require adjusting the data from the Department of Agriculture significantly. We did it on a Marginal Cost basis.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But the point is, the Cost

Shares methodology looks at single-parent household data and assumes two households instead of one. Income Shares assumes one household.

Let me just give you an example of why that made more sense. Suppose you have, under Income Shares, a mother and father each making four thousand dollars each a month. Income Shares spends on the child as if eight thousand dollars is available in a household; yet, in Income Shares, in reality, each parent has four thousand dollars to spend on that parent. essentially, Income Shares says the child has a right to a higher standard of living than either

parent. The child has spending based on eight thousand. Each parent spends on each parent as if each parent has four thousand because that's what each parent has.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The conflict with the legal principles basically revolves around the issue that there is an underlying fact -- And this is related to presumptions, and those who are attorneys probably understand the issue of underlying facts whether they exist in application of a presumption or not. Basically, there's a key underlying fact that the family's intact that overstates available income. And that underlying fact does not exist in application in any case to which these guidelines are applied. So as an economist that testifies reforming the legal principles, that is one of the

first issues that should be raised,
why you have a guideline that's
based on underlying facts that do
not exist in any case to which
they're applied.

The Cost Shares methodology assumes two households. It's based on average income, and then much of the allocation procedure after that looks very similar. The cost tables for the southeast can be found in legislation in Georgia in House Bill 149. There is similar legislation in Minnesota. I don't recall that legislation.

If you turn to page -- Let's jump to page 11. What the Cost Shares explicitly tries to do that Income Shares is very piecemeal about, in any guideline, there are two key facets. Number one, the cost schedule, what it costs. That's the first issue. The second issue is how you allocate

the cost from the cost schedule.

Any guideline answers both of those questions. Cost Shares explicitly approaches the issue of integrating cost schedule and the allocation of the cost according to equal duty of support. With Income Shares, it's a loose relationship which each state may choose to implement in varying degrees of whether there's equal duty of support or not.

If you look at page 11, you see two charts that show child-related tax benefits as charted against gross income. This is how much extra after-tax income a custodial parent gets depending on what the gross income is. And this is just the federal child-related tax benefits. The chart at the top of the page includes all of the child-related tax benefits, earned income tax credits, household status,

exemptions, child tax credits. It
does not include child care
credits. That's separate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The bottom chart shows what the child-related tax benefits would be if you had a very narrow definition, just the exemptions and child tax credits. Using just the very narrow definition, the child-related tax credit typically is worth a hundred dollars in extra after-tax income per month per child. And if one applies a principle of equal duty of support, then it would be logical that if both parents share the before-tax cost, the parents should also share the tax offsets. So to fully implement equal duty of support, you need to take into account the child-related tax credits.

And if we skip to page 13, you can see an example with no parenting-time adjustment. I

1 don't have the cost tables. 2 the calculation procedure is very 3 similar to Income Shares. The 4 cost table is different, but it 5 also builds in some of these 6 equal-duty-of-support features. 7 We've got a combined standard 8 cost of ten sixteen, and we've got 9 the father's and mother's gross 10 incomes. So we're going to 11 assume no parenting time in this 12 The mother's expenses are case. 13 a thousand sixteen. But as a cost 14 offset, the mother, as custodial 15 parent, gets an extra two hundred 16 and seventy-three dollars a month 17 in after-tax income as a cost offset. So instead of prorating 18 19 the thousand sixteen, you prorate 20 the seven forty-three. That 21 would apply equal duty of support 22 standards.

Then if you turn to page 15, it is basically the same example but applying a parenting-time

23

24

1	aujustinent. And Jane Venoni did
2	a great job talking about the
3	alternative parenting time
4	arrangements. But this is a very
5	simplistic line. I've become a
6	big fan of the Arizona parenting-
7	time adjustment, though there's
8	always opportunities for
9	improvement. In this example,
10	it's a straight-line adjustment
11	parenting time where you prorate
12	the one thousand and sixteen in
13	child cost according to each
14	parent's share of parenting time.
15	You have an expense column for
16	each parent. And then you
17	subtract the child-related tax
18	benefit, and then you prorate the
19	remainder. The father pays a
20	share of the mother's expenses,
21	and the mother shares the father's
22	expenses. That's meeting the
23	principle of equal duty of
24	support.
25	That's a very simplified

version of Cost Shares. But I think what three things -- You know, at this moment, three things stand out to differentiate Cost Shares. The cost table is based on single-parent data, including equal-duty-of-support standards through presumptively applying the cost offset from the tax benefit and presumptively including the parenting-time adjustment.

Now, what I want to do now is show the big picture. There's a very small handout. I'm going to zip through this. Standard
Income Shares Guidelines, North
Carolina as an Example. And one of the issues when I'm in court is, is the presumptive award equitable.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm sorry. What paper?

MR. ROGERS: It looks like this, very small, and it says,

Standard Income Shares

Guidelines, North Carolina as an

Example. Does everyone have

that? All right. Very good.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What I want to do here is present the big picture of the impact of Income Shares guidelines in terms of the equity issue, does it make sense in terms of being fair. The proposed guidelines, based on very cursory review, show that the proposed Alabama guidelines are very similar to the ones that already exist in North Carolina. There are some differences, and I suspect they're related to differences in state income taxes. We've already done some work in North Carolina, and this is an example of the outcome.

So what we can do is -- What is the impact of presumptive award in a typical case where both parents have parenting time?

We're going to assume twentyfive percent with the
noncustodial parent. Custodial
parent has child-related tax
benefits. North Carolina does
have a presumptive parenting-time
adjustment, but there's a
minimum. So this example does
not get into that range. The
minimum is about one-third of the
parenting time. And I'm just
going to kind of zip through this
idea.

Turn to page 2, Table 1 and

Table 2. The idea is to compare

what is the impact of the standard

of living of each household, the

custodial and the noncustodial

parent households. And the

standard of living will depend not

just on the adults in the

household, but also the children

in the household. Because

there's parenting time for both

parents, both parents have

parenting time costs that affect the standard of living.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what we want to do is have a benchmark of, you know, how much after-tax, after-childsupport -- This is the comparison: What is the after-tax, afterchild-support income of each parent? After the noncustodial parent and custodial parent pay taxes and after the noncustodial parent pays the child support award, how much income does that household have and how much income is that to a benchmark for a standard of living? And basically, we're going to have a poverty threshold for one, two, and three children based on the amount of parenting time. And I'm just going to say the benchmarks are Table 2.

So we'll want to look at -Turn to page 3. These -- If I
used Alabama, the numbers are

going to be very similar, little differences in income taxes and small differences in the cost schedules.

We're going to have one simple example. Both parents have four thousand a month. And these are annual numbers, fortyeight thousand. The noncustodial parent after-tax income, thirtyfour thousand six hundred. The custodial parent, thirty-seven thousand six hundred and sixty-three because of the child-related tax benefits. This is for one child.

And using a very similar

Income Shares cost schedule and calculation, the noncustodial parent's after-tax and after-child-support income is twenty-nine thousand five dollars. The custodial parent's is forty-three thousand-odd dollars. Then you compare that to the ratio of the

poverty thresholds for each
according to parenting time. And
the custodial parent's multiples
of the poverty threshold is three
point seven. The noncustodial
parent's is two point nine
rounded.

So basically, even though they start out with the same gross income, because of the economic nature of the Income Shares guideline, the custodial parent ends up with a twenty-nine percent higher standard of living.

And then there are three basic reasons for that. The cost schedule is based on intact family data. The guidelines do not presumptively take into account the child-related tax benefits.

And up to this point, the guidelines do not treat both parents' parenting times equally.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Can I ask a question?

_ -

1 MR. ROGERS: Sure. COMMITTEE MEMBER: I may 2 3 not be understanding. I'm probably not. 4 5 MR. ROGERS: I went through 6 a lot quickly. COMMITTEE MEMBER: By 8 increasing the custodial parent to 9 twenty-nine percent, isn't that 10 consistent with what the column 11 -- the sum of the estimated child-12 rearing expenses are? 13 MR. ROGERS: No, that's --14 This -- That's how much higher 15 the custodial parent's standard of 16 living is. 17 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Yes. Right, but they also have that 18 child they're paying for. 19 MR. ROGERS: Well, but this 20 21 calculation takes into account the 22 higher cost of that child. 23 custodial parent's benchmark is 24 eleven thousand six hundred and

forty based on three quarters of

the parenting time. The
noncustodial parent's benchmark
is ten thousand one hundred and
nineteen. It's lower. So the
custodial parent does have higher
costs, and taking that into
account, the custodial parent
household still has a twenty-nine
percent higher standard of living.

But the point is, they both started out with equal gross incomes. Why should a guideline result in one parent having a higher standard of living if they start out with the same income?

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I don't have that (inaudible). Does that take into account the -- any credit to the custodial parent for all the in-kind care provided by the custodial parent?

MR. ROGERS: No, it does not, but if --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: How
can you conclude there's a

1 twenty-nine percent higher 2 standard of living if they have 3 the custodial parent taking care of this child night after night 4 5 after night --6 MR. ROGERS: I'm going to --COMMITTEE MEMBER: None 8 of these models address that that 9 I've heard. 10 MR. ROGERS: I'm just going 11 to give you the short answer. 12 This is something that could be 13 debated at length. As Jane 14 Venohr indicated earlier, almost 15 all the guidelines only look at 16 out-of-pocket expenses. When --17 even from an economist 18 perspective, I've testified in court related to issues of 19 20 personal injury, and you get into 21 what economists call 22 (unintelligible), what's the value

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm not concerned about that. I'm

23

24

25

of --

concerned about the invalidity of your conclusion.

MR. ROGERS: Now, my point is, when you -- The standard of living looks at goods and services. That's just a very technical definition. When you get into the issue of compensation for time spent raising the child, that really -- just to be blunt -- it opens a can of worms.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I agree.

MR. ROGERS: And just a quick elaboration, what you're also ignoring is, what is the value of the enjoyment of raising the child. Do you offset the --Basically, economists would say you're raising the issue of the loss of leisure. Do you calculate the value of lost leisure but then offset it by the enjoyment of raising the child? Then to make

1 it even more complicated, what 2 about if the noncustodial parent 3 actually wanted more time with the child but was denied more 4 5 time? Should you factor in the 6 lost enjoyment of raising the child that the noncustodial parent 8 would like to have? If one added 9 that calculation, theoretically, 10 the custodial parent should be 11 compensating the noncustodial 12 parent for being denied that 13 opportunity. So it's really a 14 huge can of worms to get into 15 that kind of issue. But solely 16 looking at goods and services 17 consumed, the Income Shares 18 guideline typically has this 19 outcome.

And I'm going to go back to try and wrap some of this up. Go back to the thick handout.

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: The ultimate question, because this is where I think I see the difference

1 on your adjusted poverty 2 threshold --3 MR. ROGERS: Yes. 4 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Under your concept, you'll have a 5 6 custodial parent with three quarters of the time with the 8 child and one quarter with the 9 noncustodial. Yet we have only 10 approximately fifteen hundred dollars difference in 11 12 expenditures. 13 MR. ROGERS: This is at the 14 poverty level. 15 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Poverty 16 17

level. The difference is you are tracking that at only a thousand dollars a month difference. And then you figure it up where you come out with twenty-nine percent

MR. ROGERS: But when you do it in terms of a ratio, that ratio actually continues in the same proportion --

25

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 COMMITEE MEMBER: 2 understand it goes higher, but 3 still it's misleading to believe that there is only fifteen hundred 4 5 dollars for three quarters of the 6 period of time for bringing up the child. 8 MR. ROGERS: It's the 9 percentage difference that 10 matters, not the dollar, because 11 if you actually extrapolate the 12 multiples, this actually -- This 13 methodology, if you go into the 14 economic detail, actually 15 understates the custodial parent's 16 standard of living because child 17 costs tend to decrease 18 proportionally as you go -- get 19 higher above the poverty 20 threshold. So this is actually 21 conservative methodology as far 22 as standards of living. Yes? 23 24 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Before

I forget, I just want to -- I mean,

1 some of this is a little over my 2 head so -- But, anyway, I want to 3 address the in-kind, the payment for in-kind. 4 5 MR. ROGERS: Yes. COMMITTEE MEMBER: 6 7 Wouldn't that be offset because 8 all of it is offset in the time for 9 the parenting time because that 10 same noncustodial parent, if he 11 had him twenty-five percent of 12 the time, would have the in-kind 13 service for the twenty-five percent of the time. All of it is 14 15 going to be based on --16 MR. ROGERS: Not necessarily. I guess it would 17 depend on --18 19 COMMITTEE MEMBER: -- time 20 with the child? 21 MR. ROGERS: It depends on 22 how much parenting time each 23 parent has. It's really a can of 24 worms to get into the value of

being a parent. Should you be

paid to be a parent?

Simple -- Just looking at it,
maybe where I come from, it looks
to me like if you've had in-kind
services, you divide seventy-five
percent of the time because the
other parent has in-kind services
that he provides twenty-five
percent of the time. So that's all
really taken care of in that
parenting time --

MR. ROGERS: Well, it applies to both parents, but if one parent has more than fifty percent of the time, it raises the issue of difference. I just think it's a can of worms that -- I'm not sure why -- I wouldn't ever say never, but I think it should not be an issue typically raised to be paid to either parent. I would never say never because that would be irrebuttable.

I think I need to wind up.

There are more tables in here of the standard of living comparisons. The Income Shares guideline has some peculiar equity outcomes unless adjustments are made to the Income Shares guideline.

And I'm going to wind up back with this paper, A Brief Summary.

This is actually what I was first asked to do. I'm just going to touch on this. And I've reviewed the current Code and Rule 32.

And turn to page 6. There are actually some portions of the guidelines, which I think create some legal issues in terms of rebuttable presumptions, whether they are factual or arbitrary.

The first one has to do with the stated assumption that the guidelines assume standard visitation. I don't think there's any factual basis for that. The cost tables in the current

assume the child is in one household. So there's really no factual basis for that.

Turning to page 7, this is a minor technical issue related to self-employment income. I'm not going to elaborate on that. There should be an adjustment for self-employment income to be comparable with payroll income. Other states do that. It's a very minor issue. But in terms of comparable ability to pay definitions, it should be addressed.

Bottom of page 7 continuing, there is at least misleading statements relating to the tax exemptions. You could go into a lot of detail. I just presented a paper at an economics conference that will hopefully be published. There is no child-related cost offset taken into account in the

cost tables. That is factually incorrect.

Page 9, just repeating in a separate section the commentary on visitation. There is no builtin standard visitation cost table. That's what you call basic arbitrary.

The last issue, and it's going to lead into some suggestions, the cost schedule is based on intact family cost data. Basically, you're having cost data based on a situation that does not exist in application. And what I would recommend -- And I think the guidelines that have been proposed can be adjusted to work well in terms of applying equal duty of support and reflecting actual circumstances.

Basically, you need to delete the commentary related to the tax benefits and standard visitation.

Also, we recommend that the cost

1 schedule be adjusted, and I've 2 done this in some specific cases 3 that I've testified on. Basically, 4 the cost schedule can be adapted 5 to where it's on a two-household 6 basis. Some states have started looking at what's called a second 8 household discount. The basic 9 question is, what is the 10 difference between the income 11 that's discretionary or available 12 for child cost once the adult 13 housing expenses are paid. It's 14 basically the extra cost of the 15 second house.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So a simple adjustment of subtracting from combined income the cost of the second house mortgage or rent and utilities would basically put the cost schedule on a two-household basis. That would be one of my strong recommendations.

Number one, adjust the cost schedule with a second household

discount. Number two,

incorporate child-related tax

benefits as a cost offset, and

then presumptively include a

parenting-time adjustment.

And I've covered a lot of territory. And I'm going to stop there.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have a question. Mr. Rogers, you say that you were retained or asked to do something. Who retained you?

MR. ROGERS: Yes. Alabama

Family Rights Association asked me to provide a cursory review, but my view in doing that is to act as an expert and be able to withstand what's called the peer review.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I was on the committee that adopted the original Income Shares model back in the eighties. And we looked at five different guideline concepts. Was your Cost Shares

concept available at that time?

1

2 MR. ROGERS: That was a 3 theoretical concept at that time. Now, let me point out -- make one 4 5 comment. Alabama, Virginia, 6 South Carolina, and I believe, Louisiana now, has special 8 adjustments to the costs table to 9 reflect the income distribution 10 relative to the U.S. As an economist, I would actually have 11 12 to say, that is an arbitrary 13 adjustment. But I think the 14 intuition was at that time -- not 15 just in Alabama but in these other 16 states, was the guideline cost 17 schedule just seemed to high. And what I'm suggesting is you 18 19 may -- I say may because I 20 haven't done all the number-21 crunching -- you may have made 22 the right decision but for the 23 wrong reason. It really is not 24 economically sound to make the 25 income distribution adjustment.

It would be economically sound to make the second household adjustment, and that would be economically valid, basically to just reconstruct the second table for the additional cost by incomes. Would not be a big deal. Could even be incorporated into the cost schedule. You would have sort of the same result, but it would be economically sound.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: If we adopted some of your proposals, would the child support generally go up or down?

MR. ROGERS: The cost would go down to the extent that you reduce the schedule for the second household discount. Then the next question is, does the spending go up or down versus how is it allocated between the parents. If you adopt my proposal, the spending does not

really change, but it's recognized that there are actually three parties that pay child costs in child support cases: The mother, the father, and the government.

We can forget about the third.

What this proposal would do would recognize that there are three parties paying child costs, not two. And it would also recognize that it's just as valid that when a noncustodial parent cares for the child twenty-five percent of the time, that is just as valid as valid a contribution as cash.

And what I like to do -- And I don't have a good example here, at least not without digging.

When I go into court, I'll show these rebuttal calculations. And the cash is generally a lot smaller than expected, but when you add the total amount spent on the child, you add the cash transfer, add how much the

custodial parent spends, you add how much the noncustodial parent spends, then you add the child-related tax benefits, when you pull all those components together, the total spending is actually quite high even though the cash transfer is quite small.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm sorry. Are you saying that the court order would go up or down? That was my question. I'm sorry.

MR. ROGERS: The court order, the cash award, would go down. But this methodology would recognize that the total spending is still quite large.
There's a huge difference between just the cash transfer versus what both parents spend directly plus the government contributes to the custodial parent that should be shared. That's what the standard guideline forgets. It forgets to add up all of these different

pieces, and if you apply the constitutional principles of the guidelines cannot be arbitrary, must be of factual basis, and you apply a standard for equal duty of support, you can still have a very high spending level on the children, but the cash transfer is not that large and shouldn't be, not if you imply equal duty of support.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Has

Cost Shares been adopted in some
states?

MR. ROGERS: It has only been adopted in pieces. Most states actually have the Cost Shares concept for add-ons, such as child care, extraordinary medical. And what Cost Shares really means is looking at the actual spending and the --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: And that's what Alabama does with its child care and extraordinary

medical.

MR. ROGERS: That's the Cost Shares methodology, but it's only on the add-ons. But if you like Policy Studies' proposal, I think it is not hard to adapt it where it has a stronger economic basis and have the second-household discount, then apply the child-related tax benefits as an offset.

I would actually recommend looking at a bill in Georgia. It's not going to go anywhere this year because it's an election year. It's House Bill 1452. It's North Carolina's guideline cost table, plus Arizona's parenting-time adjustment, plus a very simple version of the child-related tax benefits. It would be some good legislation to look at, House Bill 1452.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: This business of child-related tax benefits escapes me because

2 1 2 1 aren't you assuming 2 speculating on what that is? How 3 can you know what that situation is until the year is over? Isn't 4 that arbitrary? 5 6 MR. ROGERS: Well, that's partly true depending on your 8 definition of the child-related tax benefits. If --9 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER: (Inaudible) federal definition --11 12 MR. ROGERS: Well, if you're

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

looking at the earned income tax credits, there's a lot of uncertainty there. But, number one, you're assuming what the income is for both parents anyway. You're making an assumption. You're making a finding of fact. The gross income of the mother is X. The gross income of the father is Y. You already have all the information you need, and you know the number of children.

You can have a very narrow
definition related to the
exemptions and child tax credits.
You can have it slightly broader
to include head of household
status.

But once you have each

parent's income, gross income,

and the number of children,

you're locked in anyway until you

want to modify. It's no

difference. It's really no

difference.

And the numbers are huge. It is typically thousands of dollars each year in child-related tax benefits. It's a windfall.

Basically, if you do not take those into account, the custodial parent has a lower duty of support than the noncustodial parent. You violate the principle of the equal duty of support. I mean, from a legal perspective, it's that straightforward. You

want to have the principle of equal duty of support.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What you're saying is that Alabama and thirty-two other states have unconstitutional guidelines right now.

MR. ROGERS: I'm saying that they are not economically sound.

I've learned to not say they're unconstitutional as loudly and as often. But certainly, they could be rebutted or --

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Do you know of any guidelines that have been successfully challenged in court on that basis?

MR. ROGERS: I know some that were temporarily successfully challenged. Arizona actually has language in their Code that mandates prorating the exemptions between the parents based on the proportion of their gross incomes. It actually gives

some examples where if one

parent has twice as much gross

income, then that parent should

have the exemptions twice as

often. So it's built into the

Arizona -- It's a little more

awkward, I personally think.

The language in the bill in

Georgia says you can have a -- by

court rule, the table, the look-up

table each year of what the child
related tax benefits would be

worth. It's not a big deal.

Indiana specifically said the

child-related tax benefits are not

taken into account.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have one more question. As I understand it, your proposal would be to add in -- subtract the second household on the gross income and then --

MR. ROGERS: Subtract -There's actually national data,
and I am familiar with some state

data on housing costs. The IRS actually publishes county data on that. They do a little --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE MEMBER: But my question is, you take that approach and make adjustments for second household, and then you also are going to have a shared-parenting adjustment. I thought one of the concepts of shared parenting was that the -was that both the parents were getting credit for the household and all the caring the caregiver (inaudible) the primary caretaker where if you had shared, you share -- Like the man here said, he had the child forty percent of the time. I thought the argument there was that they should have credit for that time because they were not being credited for the expenses that they incurred. It seems to me there would a duplication.

1 MR. ROGERS: It's actually --2 It's a subtlety, I have to admit. 3 They are two separate issues. The Income Shares cost table 4 5 assumes that both parents still 6 live in the same house, that you have an intact family, and it 8 assumes that the --- we'll call it 9 -- discretionary income is based 10 on you only have one mortgage, 11 one set of utilities. So by being 12 an intact family, you have more 13 discretionary income on children, 14 which means if you're intact, if 15 you have two adults living 16 together, you have more income to spend on the children, so the cost 17 18 table would be higher. Now, when you're divorced, 19 20 you've got two houses. So, for 21 the same amount of income, 22 whatever the incomes were when

married, you're divorced and you've still got the same income,

you were living together,

23

24

25

but now you have two mortgages or two rents and two utilities, heat, electricity. Call that the adult overhead. So the difference in the amount of discretionary income for spending on children is how much income goes toward that adult overhead, and it doesn't matter whether that second adult has any parenting time or not because you still have to pay the adult overhead first.

The parenting-time adjustment is a separate issue. But if you wanted to have a cost table that conformed to the idea that a presumption should have underlying facts that exist in application -- And that's an issue that gets raised in court when I testify a lot. There are a lot of assumptions in the guidelines that don't exist in application in terms of rebuttal. You could take intact family data and make that

one adjustment, and I think it would be relatively economically sound.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'm not sure you answered my question. I didn't understand if you did. My question was, if you -- At this point, there's a presumption or there was a presumption yesterday that the parent who had a child forty percent of the time should have an offset or credit for additional expenses that he or she incurred.

MR. ROGERS: Right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Okay.

If you're already adding or subtracting, however you formulate that, by putting the second household expenses, it seems to me there is a double consideration there.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well,
you would just be considering the
additional expense of having the

child forty percent of the time.

You would only factor in variable costs like food, not fixed costs such as the housing. Is that correct?

MR. ROGERS: I'm sorry. I had a little noise here.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: If you want to adjust the cost, support cost or allowance because a parent has the child forty percent of the time, you would not change the amount of the fixed costs, such as housing costs. You would only adjust to some extent the variable costs, such as food.

MR. ROGERS: Well, the way I would do it is you would have the second-household discount only for the amount of housing for the adult, which would be a very tight definition. But you don't want to blend that in if that adult doesn't have any parenting time.

So what you would do, you would

later factor in if there is additional housing costs for parenting time. Like with the Arizona plan, you would factor in after a significant percentage of parenting time. But it's a subtlety, but it's a separate issue of the second-household discount just for the adult versus the parenting-time adjustment that is related to the child cost. One is for the adult overhead, and the other is for the child expenses. It's a subtlety, I admit.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Okay.

Now, what you're -- You're saying that there are figures based on housing costs that you would have a table to use for that. Like, John couldn't go out and marry an heiress and live in a five thousand square foot house and say, I have a five thousand dollar a month house payment.

How would that --

1 MR. ROGERS: As a

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

presumption, you would want to add some reasonable numbers. But, again, everything should be rebuttable, which means even that should be rebuttable. I think that's goofy, but that was your point. But, yes, you should have some very statistically-oriented numbers based on how much is spent on housing at different income levels. And the interesting thing about this with the little bit of work that I've done on this, the dollar values go up with income, but the lower income levels, the size of the impact is bigger. And one thing that wasn't -- And I think that's a good thing, one thing that was not discussed. And this is a problem with all child cost tables based on the Consumer Expenditure Survey, especially at low income levels.

1 The data actually show in 2 many cases for low income 3 families, spending -- total 4 spending exceeds actual income, 5 which raises the issue of whether 6 the cost tables have this bias. 7 haven't seen a good answer to 8 that problem. But the second-9 household adjustment would have 10 a declining impact at higher 11 income levels and more of an 12 impact at the lower income 13 levels, if correctly done. I think 14 that it would have a lot of good 15 economic features. 16 JUDGE GOSA: Any other 17 questions? COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have 18 one. What is your definition of a 19 20 second household? 21 MR. ROGERS: It's -- All right. Just generally, the fact 22 23 that you need a second house. 24 Now, what you may be asking --25 And I'm interpreting. You're

asking, Well, do we measure it by the custodial parent or by the noncustodial parent. That may be what you're asking.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: A noncustodial parent (inaudible).

MR. ROGERS: Well, the way I would answer it is, why not use an average. And if you're looking at the income of both parents, it's actually -- You already have all the information. With the basic cost table, you're looking at combined income. So for the second-household adjustment, you would look at the average of that income for what you want the discount to be related to.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well,
how would you qualify for that
second household? The reason I
ask that is when you get into a
blacker area, you find that twenty
percent of the noncustodial

parents will come up and say, I live with so-and-so, I don't own my home, I'm not paying a mortgage note, I'm living with my mother, I'm living with my girlfriend, I'm living with soand-so. So how do you -- How would that fit in under that second-income household under your model?

MR. ROGERS: You raise an interesting question. When economists have tough times answering questions, you can always resort to the idea of opportunity costs, and I'm sure somehow that answers your question. But someone is paying for the second household.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Well, the reason I ask is under the ideal situation (inaudible), you have a second house or mortgage or all this. But we see it so often in the blacker counties

where that is not the case, and I

could see how -
COMMITTEE MEMBER: Would

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Would you not refer to the average -- I mean, the government average or whatever the average is in their

COMMITTEE MEMBER:

Wouldn't that assume an arbitrary figure, though?

(Whereupon, several people began speaking

simultaneously.)

COMMITTEE MEMBER: How
does your model treat the
children in the second home of
the noncustodial parent?

MR. ROGERS: Cost Shares

does not have an economic

preference. Actually, from an
economist's perspective, the
additional dependent issue is one
of those -- it's one of those
which fall in the category of
mathematically insolvable. If

you want a purely equitable
outcome, it's not mathematically
solvable, so you have to find a
solution that you're satisfied
with. My personal preference is
the dummy order approach and not
exclude any particular category
of dependents.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: In
other words, you wouldn't
distinguish between prior-born
and after-born?

MR. ROGERS: That could be what would become an irrebuttable presumption, so I would not exclude -- Any time you have a guideline that has some facet that says, Except for, there's a real good chance that's an irrebuttable presumption and not only would conflict with federal regulations but basic due process of a presumption.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Do you use your principles to testify in

court for the custodial parent seeking an increase in child support?

MR. ROGERS: Yes. But the methodology -- I actually use more than one methodology, a two-handed economist, you know. I do like to use Cost Shares, but also, whatever the state's guideline is, I always try to, Okay, how can we take that guideline and quantify deviation factors and make some adjustments. So there are ways to do both.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Just one question, and this is my last one. If I understand you, this paper that Mr. Graham did -- And he's saying that we probably -- that we're not in compliance with federal regulations. And if I understand you correctly, if we adopt the proposal, we would be in compliance? I heard you one

time say, You could be brought in compliance. So are you saying that if we adopt it as proposed, that we would be brought into federal compliance?

MR. ROGERS: What I would strongly recommend is reviewing what Mr. Graham has discussed in terms of legal presumptions, treat the guidelines as a legal presumption, not just as a policy decision but as a legal presumption, and then you would want to review the facets of any proposals in terms of any degree of arbitrariness, is there a factual basis, does it apply the principle of equal duty of support.

And I really had not had time to prepare a lot in terms of the Cost Shares, but it would be doable. But if you wanted to go with Policy Studies'

recommendation, I think it would

need to be adjusted for the issues that I've raised. And I think it would address the longstanding issue in Alabama, Virginia, Louisiana, South Carolina, that the cost tables just seem high. Well, it's not economically sound to do the income distribution thing. It's not. But I think it would be reasonable to make the second-household adjustment. JUDGE GOSA: Any more

JUDGE GOSA: Any more questions? Thank you.

Let me talk to the committee here. After the break, I got a sense that we can't complete our work today.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: You'revery perceptive.

JUDGE GOSA: I detect some restlessness. We need to talk about another meeting, I guess. I'm just wondering if Fridays are normally the best day of the week for meeting. What about -- Let's

1 just talk about it out loud. I had a calendar when I came here. I'm 2 3 looking for my court calendar. I've got it with me somewhere all 4 5 the time, and I know all of you 6 have the same problem I do. But it's not easy. In our circuit, we 8 have one court reporter for four 9 judges, and it's not easy to 10 juggle your dockets around. And 11 my schedules are completed 12 through the end of June (inaudible). What does March 13 26th look like to you all? 14 15 COMMITTEE MEMBER: That's 16 spring break. 17 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Yes, that's spring break. 18 JUDGE GOSA: (Inaudible.) 19 20 The next Friday that I have would be April 30th. I think while this 21 22 is fresh on our mind, we need to 23 get back together as soon as we 24 can. That's the next Friday I can

be here. That's six weeks away.

25

1	COMMITTEE MEMBER: I'll be
2	out of town on that day.
3	JUDGE GOSA: What about a
4	Monday? I try to leave Mondays
5	open because I have to do initial
6	appearances and all that stuff on
7	Monday. I don't have a
8	(inaudible). My next Monday
9	Any Monday in March?
10	(Whereupon, Videotape 4
11	ended.)
12	* * * *
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

STATE OF ALABAMA ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES AND ENFORCEMENT MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA

IN RE: CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES

COMMITTEE MEETING

March 12, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION OF REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT

I, Laura A. Head, Court
Reporter for the State of Alabama
at Large, do hereby certify that I
have this date completed a true
and correct transcription to the
best of my ability from
videotapes of the committee
meeting held in the above-styled
cause had and done by the
Advisory Committee on Child
Support Guidelines and

Enforcement, Alabama Judicial Building, 300 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Alabama, on Friday, March 12th, 2004. All pages are numbered serially with the numbers appearing in the top right-hand corner of each page, and the transcript ends with the number appearing at the top of this Certificate.

DATED this 15th day of April, 2005.

> LAURA A. HEAD Court Reporter